

limitation, although we were not present when the unanimous-consent agreement was effected; but we do think there ought to be a short period of time in which we might place matters in the RECORD and make 5- or 10-minute presentations to the Senate, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to my good friend that I am hopeful we can finish that bill tomorrow. On Friday, as the hours grow later, it will be harder to keep Senators on the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I realize that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would rather they would wait until after we finish. Tomorrow will be Friday. That is why I should like to finish the bill tomorrow. I should like to dispose of both appropriation bills tomorrow, if possible.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have matters which must be taken up because of the running of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know what the Senator has in mind. They would be matters of business, not merely speeches, and we might be able to dispose of them. They would involve the transaction of business. I shall be glad to confer with the Senator about them.

Mr. McCARRAN. There may be some speeches in connection with them.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think there will be many speeches. But I shall confer with the Senator. I think we might arrange with him to dispose of the resolution about which he has spoken to me. I know what he has in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 24), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Col. John D. Billingsley, O17188, for appointment as professor of ordnance, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, and section 520 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend William Eckman, S. T. M., associate rector of Christ Church in Philadelphia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor

and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 23, 1951, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3804. An act to limit the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

JULY 26, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-second Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of West Virginia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable John Kee, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mrs. KEE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2192) to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "DRAW-BACK" and insert "DRAWBACK."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "sugar;" and insert "sugar, or."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "nonferrous metal;" and insert "metal, or."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "nonferrous metal; flaxseed and linseed, and flaxseed and" and insert "metal, or flaxseed or linseed, or flaxseed or."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "draw-back" and insert "drawback."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "sugar;" and insert "sugar, or."

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "nonferrous metal;" and insert "metal, or."

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "nonferrous metal; flaxseed and linseed, and flaxseed and" and insert "metal, or flaxseed or linseed, or flaxseed or."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "draw-back" and insert "drawback."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "draw-back" and insert "drawback."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "merchandise," and insert "merchandise."

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the minority approve these amendments. We have no objection to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCTIONS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in thorough agreement with the objectives of the Jensen rider which has been attached to the several appropriation bills. I believe most Members of the House are firm believers in the objectives.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] deserves credit for having insisted upon these reductions in Federal employment. However, it is my opinion that mechanically the amendment would be more workable if the various conferees would give attention to certain changes in the amendment.

The amendment provides that up to 25 percent of the vacancies occurring in the various departments shall not be filled, with certain exceptions. In this time of emergency notwithstanding the fact that most Federal employees do a good job, we must curtail domestic expenditures, including the total number of Federal employees. When we do that in any given agency and make the reductions in employees it makes it even more necessary that some discretion be given to the operating head of the agency to use the remaining employees to the best advantage. Under the Jensen amendment, as I see it, practically all the vacancies might occur in one branch or in one agency and none in another. The vacancies might occur where the workload was the heaviest and no vacancies might occur where the load was the lightest. Also the operating head of the agency might well fill all the high-priced vacancies and let those unfilled be at the low levels, though the latest approach was to give some degree of protection to the lowest level.

My suggestion would be to retain the objectives of the Jensen rider, with due credit to the gentleman from Iowa, but modify it by providing that each agency should reduce its personnel by a given number or given percentage each quarter of the year, such required reduction

being for the quarter and fixing it so that the goal or total reduction as provided for the quarter be completed by the end of such quarter. Such provision should provide that insofar as practical such reduction should be made by not filling vacancies. Either in the provisions of the act or in the committee report it should be provided that in making the reductions the agency should not substantially raise the average grade classification or average salary.

Such approach would bring about the needed reductions. It would give to the operating head of the agency leeway and discretion within his agency so as to meet the workload problems and require the reductions in those points where the workload was least. And further this would see to it that the reduction made was on such basis as not to leave vacancies at the lower level by keeping the higher-priced positions filled.

I think this approach is workable. Certainly I feel that my efforts in the Congress would indicate that I am sincere in my suggestions. I was the author of the Whitten rider last year which limits the total number of employees to that of September 1, 1950, and which further prevents the upgrading of permanent employees which was done in the last year at a cost of about a billion dollars a year in Government operating expenses. The rider which I wrote last year is estimated to save about one-half billion dollars a year and will be up for consideration for continuance in the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my suggestion here may have the consideration of those handling the various conferences on appropriations.

TERMINATING THE STATE OF WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF GERMANY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 356, Rept. No. 758), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 196)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, a report on our participation in the work of the United Nations during 1950.

It is a record of decision and action in the face of danger and, at the same time, a record of increasing efforts to promote human progress in the attainment of the basic objectives of the United Nations Charter. It is for the most part a record of solidarity among United Nations members against aggression.

The struggle of the United Nations against Communist aggression in 1950 has a deep significance that reaches beyond the momentary successes and reverses recorded. This significance lies in the simple fact that the United Nations acted promptly and resolutely, and with success, against deliberate, treacherous, and well-prepared aggression. The aggressors and their supporters undoubtedly believed that the organization and its members would not come to the defense of Korea with timely and effective help. It is probable that one of the purposes of the attack was to break down—through such a failure—any possibility of effective United Nations action against aggression in the future.

As the world knows, the United Nations met the assault squarely and without hesitation. In so doing, it made clear that an aggressor will not be allowed to isolate and destroy his victims one by one. The United Nations elected to act now rather than to drift passively once more down the fatal trail of failure to oppose aggression which leads finally to total war. Thousands of men have therefore sacrificed their lives in Korea to the end that millions may not lose their lives in a world war.

There is much to indicate that the resolute resistance of United Nations troops has given pause to those aggressive forces which coldbloodedly brought tragedy to Korea.

In these great events the United States has taken a worthy and responsible part. American troops fighting in Korea are a major bulwark of the international community against the barbarous forces that would debase and destroy it. American fighting men have rarely in all our history struck more important blows for human freedom and welfare. I am proud—and I know the American people are proud—of the fight which our men, together with their comrades in arms, have waged in Korea.

The army and people of the Republic of Korea have heroically and patiently endured the brunt of the Communist aggression. The story of their unwavering resistance to that aggression is an epic in the annals of the struggle of free men to maintain their liberty and independence.

I should like to pay special tribute to the gallant fighting men of the other countries who defended the cause of the United Nations in battle during 1950—men from Australia, Belgium, Canada,

France, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom.

Fighting units for Ethiopia arrived in Korea in early May 1951, and units from Colombia arrived in early June 1951. Hospital units and ships from Denmark, India, Norway, and Sweden also are operating in the Korean area.

United Nations action in Korea has been truly collective action. Concrete aid in the form of combat troops, ships and planes, field hospitals and medical equipment, other equipment, supplies, and food has been made available by 39 members of the United Nations; political support, by no less than 53 members. These countries vary greatly in their abilities to contribute to a collective military operation such as that in Korea. Contributions equal in number and identical in kind are obviously impossible. Nevertheless it must be recognized that every free country, large and small, is vitally—and I should say equally—interested in world security.

Much has been said in the Congress and in public forums on all phases of our action in Korea. Discussion and honest criticism are in the best traditions of our people and are in fact essential to the working of our system of Government. As on other subjects, I welcome them in connection with our record in the United Nations. Throughout the world, Communist propaganda has of course sought to represent this country's action as imperialism dictated by material interests. I do not believe that, wherever the channels of opinion are free, our basic purposes will be misunderstood. Our action in the Korean crisis was not dictated by any American material interest there. We neither sought nor do we seek any special position or privilege in Korea. Our action in the crisis was motivated by our deep conviction of the importance of preventing a breakdown of the international security system and of the principles of the Charter. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now, that to have ignored the appeal of Korea for aid, to have stood aside from the assault upon the Charter, would have meant the end of the United Nations as a shield against aggression. It might have meant the end of any possibility that collective security could be made to work.

Under the Charter, the United Nations must afford protection against aggression, whether committed by big countries or by small countries. Just as the United Nations branded as aggression the original assault by the North Korean Communist regime, so it has branded as aggression the later intervention by the Chinese Communist regime and its attack upon United Nations forces. There are not two laws, one for small and one for large countries. Indeed it is hard to see how the United Nations could ever operate under such a double standard. This does not of course mean that the United Nations has acted blindly, without carefully considering the effects of its measures. In fact the record shows a most careful concern by the great majority of members, including this country, to avoid extension of the conflict

and to preserve unity while maintaining our objective of resisting aggression.

While our primary and immediate task has been defense against aggression and the creation of collective measures for accomplishing this more effectively, we have not lost sight of the objective of creating an international security system based upon the reduction and control of armaments. In my statement to the General Assembly on October 24, 1950, I made clear our continued determination to work toward this goal in every practicable way.

The aggression against the United Nations has brought home to all peoples the imperative need for developing more effective means to deal with aggression within the framework of the United Nations. The Korean case has demonstrated that the United Nations can act effectively against aggression through recommendations of the Security Council, or the General Assembly, if the Security Council is paralyzed by the veto. But in Korea the participating nations had to improvise their measures from the ground up.

It was to meet this need that the Secretary of State launched at the beginning of the General Assembly in September 1950 the proposals which were developed into the Uniting for Peace Resolution. Mr. Acheson said:

The world waits to see whether we can build on the start we have made. The United Nations must move forward energetically to develop a more adequate system of collective security. If it does not move forward, it will move back.

* * * The General Assembly can and should organize itself to discharge its responsibility promptly and decisively if the Security Council is prevented from acting.

This resolution can mark the beginning of a great step forward in the development of the United Nations as an instrument for collective action to maintain peace and put down aggression. We place great hope in the program projected by this resolution, particularly the provisions relative to the maintenance by members of the United Nations of armed forces for possible service as United Nations units, and the Collective Measures Committee set up to study and report on possible methods of maintaining and strengthening international peace and security. We shall give our full support to the aims and objectives of the program and to the work of this committee in developing them.

Despite the emphasis which the United Nations has been compelled to give during the last year to action to meet aggression, it has intensified rather than slackened its various activities to promote human progress in attainment of other basic objectives of the Charter.

One of the fundamental human aspirations is the desire to control one's own destiny or, phrased in another way, to exercise the rights of self-government or independence. The organs of the United Nations which are charged with the responsibility of fulfilling the purposes of the Charter with respect to the development of non-self-governing people

made notable progress during the past year. The United States has contributed fully to these efforts.

The United Nations has intensified its efforts to combat the perennial enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, and ignorance. Through many channels and in numerous programs, the United Nations and the specialized agencies have furthered the basic goal of "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations." Of particular significance this past year was the inauguration of an expanded program of technical assistance for the economic development of underdeveloped countries. Some 56 countries of the free world have participated by making contributions, and 48 countries have initiated programs designed to use the facilities of the United Nations and specialized agencies in the development of their own human and material resources and in raising their standards of living. The United States has actively supported these activities and will continue to do so.

The weakness and the strength of the United Nations manifested in 1950 were those of a human endeavor which is still in its infancy. Despite centuries of effort, nations have only recently been able to cooperate effectively on a worldwide scale to achieve security and their other common purposes. In our limited experience we have met with many difficulties and reverses and will meet more in the future. But we have also achieved tangible success, and this success gives ground for hope that we are moving ahead on the right track. It is essential for all of us to understand that a stable peace can be achieved only through long, hard work and sacrifice. I am sure that the people of this country and of practically all countries realize that the goal of peace is worth this work and this sacrifice.

Under the stress of events in 1950 the members of the United Nations did not, of course, always see completely eye to eye. Nevertheless as loyal members the great majority strove to accommodate their views and action to the fullest possible extent in the interest of the major purposes of the United Nations. No nation has a monopoly of wisdom. Even among peoples sincerely devoted to United Nations principles—the overwhelming majority—there are bound to be differences concerning the best methods of putting these principles into effect. When we attempt honestly and frankly to work out these differences in the common interest, no one nation can expect to have its way completely. But decisions that are the result of discussions by many countries have a moral and political force in the international community which unilateral decisions seldom have.

Two years ago I said that the first point of our four-point foreign-policy program would be "to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies" and "to continue to search for ways to strengthen their authority and increase their effectiveness."

The record of our participation in 1950, set forth in the following pages, shows that we have not faltered in our support. I know the American people are determined to persevere in this course.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1951.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

Allen, La.	Engle	Murdock
Arends	Gavin	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Boggs, La.	Gore	Norblad
Bolling	Gwinn	O'Brien, Mich.
Boykin	Hall, Edwin	Perkins
Breen	Arthur	Powell
Brehm	Halleck	Reams
Brooks	Hoffman, Ill.	Shelley
Busbey	Hollfield	Smith, Kans.
Bush	Irving	Steed
Chatham	Judd	Tackett
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Vail
Curtis, Mo.	Lucas	Wier
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Dingell	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Durham	Moulder	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 6 on page 57 of the bill. Before the Committee rose it had agreed to pass over temporarily the section on International Information and Educational Activities beginning on line 7 on page 12 of the bill until today when it shall be the first order of business.

There is now pending to that section the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER], who had been recognized for 10 minutes.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 15, line 3, strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is the gentleman from Ohio in favor of spending \$70,000,000 for the Voice of America Information Service?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think after I am through with my speech you will get the answer.

Mr. Chairman, in asking for this time, I had considerable misgivings that I would touch off emotional oratory on this very important subject. This I do not wish to do. That front has been well covered. I want to justify this as a rational necessary action for this House to take. I am sure that no such sum as seventy millions would have been allowed had we moved along 3 months ago and marked up this bill following our action cutting eighty-nine millions off this fantastic building project.

We had allowed \$32,700,000 1 year ago and the actual appropriation to this activity was \$31,700,000, September 19, 1951, when the joint action of the two Houses was agreed to the sum of \$31,100,000, 1949; \$34,000,000, 1950; plus \$13,300,000 supplementals for building.

For 1951, the \$31,700,000 was allowed. Late in 1951 came supplementals for some \$98,500,000, which your subcommittee cut to about \$82,000,000, a sum of money none of the men connected with this program had the knowledge or experience to plan to spend. The result is this "oleo" of what the world and this Congress is justly dismayed and concerned about.

It has caused these men to turn to propaganda drives to sell their brain-storm to the American public and to light fires under Members of Congress. Speakers were always available to run here and there, before this and that group of intellectuals and naive and innocent do-gooders and one-worlders, almost rivaling the sales campaign of a famous Louisiana product for the cure of the ills of mankind. No man can read the more than 200 pages of hearings on this item and follow our chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] as he patiently tried to find out what made this outfit tick without realizing that they got many, many millions more than they had the capacity to use.

This \$85,000,000 is \$13,000,000 more than we are allowing the whole State Department for salaries and expenses which sum is \$73,000,000. We should not allow this army of employees to be recruited to a strength of 12,000 and permanently saddled on our sadly harassed people. In these State Department totals, for several years there appeared the sum of \$70,000,000 for displaced per-

sons. Fondly did we on the committee hope that with passing last year of this item that we could bring you in a bill around \$200,000,000 or only ten times the amount of 1940, but this new sprawling, bawling colossus is eating up all that and crying to be doubled and redoubled like a bid in auction bridge.

It is an appeal to reason I am making. I apologize for the meager request I am making, but I hope you will sustain me in it. It is the best I can get for you with any hope for successful adoption.

What we need is a new American creed in foreign policy; one so plain all can understand, so short none can distort.

International information and educational activities conducted by the Department of State have been in progress for several years. The presumed purpose of the activities is to acquaint the people of other lands with American life and ideals and to develop in the hearts of other peoples friendship for the United States.

It is doubtful, as a matter of fact, whether the United States is as well thought of in other lands as before these activities were undertaken on the present extensive scale.

Propaganda seems to breed within itself a tendency to overstate, over-emphasize, and overindulge the virtues which it seeks to extol.

It also breeds counterpropaganda and thus inspires in those who resent its extravagant claims an effort to publicize the ridiculous, the base, the unfortunate, and the unworthy aspects of the propagandist.

The propagandist who thus subjects himself to counterpropaganda provides the leads and openings for the adversary unless the activity is performed with the greatest of skill, acquired primarily by experience. Broad-scale propaganda is dangerous because the mistakes are so far reaching. Slowly growing activities are not likely to make many mistakes. There is time for deliberation. As experience is gained and techniques perfected, comprehensive activities become practical.

This effort at rapid development of grand-scale activities by the Department of State probably accounts for the basis of criticism which has been directed thereto.

The investigative report which has been submitted to this committee is superficial and not directed to fundamental questions. It deals with internal organization—a minor matter in a rapidly changing new activity. It criticizes the slowness of the Department in the addition of personnel. In fact, the Department should have been complimented for this. It could hardly hire people until it knew specifically what they should do, to whom they should report, and where they should work. A job must first exist with its duties clearly in the mind of the supervisor.

It—the report—complains of minor errors such as putting English books in private libraries. Some of this kind of error would normally occur and be corrected. Perhaps some of it occurred be-

cause the Department was rushed beyond its own idea of what it should do.

It complains of untrue representation of American life and inadequate treatment of certain subject matter; complaints probably justified.

But the investigative report does not go into fundamentals; for example:

First. An analysis and exposition of the result the Congress sought to accomplish by providing funds and directives for the activity.

Second. Where in the world most promising efforts in accomplishing the purpose could be had and where new activity could best learn the pitfalls, without great risk of more harm than good.

Third. What kind of personnel in the way of education and experience should be hired and how well such standards have been applied in securing existing personnel.

Fourth. An analysis of persons or units of Government which should be the point of impact of the activity to secure the result Congress had in mind and whether the present activity is directed thereto and to what extent it is effective.

Fifth. An analysis of alternative means of securing like impact.

None of these fundamentals have been the subject of investigative report. Further investigative report might well consider among others the following:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. What, if anything, does change the oriental mind, the German mind, the Russian mind, and the intelligentsia, the peasant, the coolie, the government man, the industrialist, and so forth.

Can people of other countries be made friendly to us by talking about ourselves or by talking about them? Perhaps we should broadcast his ideas, and his events, and extol his heroes. It is sure he cannot live here and people are interested in their own environment—not that of the moon.

We need an investigative report along these lines and as well a superficial critique of internal management minor errors.

I was a member of the Herter Subcommittee on Strategic and Critical Materials in 1947. In Europe I was amazed to find that the so-called agricultural experts of the State Department knew absolutely nothing about the great drought that covered the Corn Belt of the United States and decreased our corn crop by a billion bushels. We were making promises all over Europe which we could not keep; yet I found in Norway and Sweden that both citizens and officials knew all about our drought and about our crop conditions and a lot more about our country than our paid people

employed by the State Department in the 9 countries which the committee visited. Let us rationalize this thing, and let us take away some of these precious millions before they clabber the thing up any worse and make it almost impossible to justify another appropriation therefor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. Ordinarily I would not make this request, but in view of the fact I was absent in the Pennsylvania primaries and could not take part in the general debate on this bill, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 1:45 p. m.

Messrs. COX and CRAWFORD objected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock, with the last 15 minutes reserved to the committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to have had the great honor recently to have represented this distinguished body on a mission that carried me over several continents and many thousands of miles. I have, in fact, just returned from that journey, which held for me and my traveling colleagues several striking lessons.

The overriding impression I gained from that experience is that in the conflict between the democratic man and the Stalinist man, the Red front is everywhere.

No corner of the world is spared the insidious and often harrowing efforts of the Kremlin conspirators to extend their domain.

Equally true is the fact that men of good will everywhere are looking to the United States for the leadership and the moral and physical strength that flow therefrom to counter, check, and overcome Russian expansionism; they are looking, too, for us to establish a condition of strength that will allow for a stabilized world situation to make possible an equitable peace.

When I say the Red front is everywhere I mean that literally. The battle for the extension of the Stalinist domain goes on night and day, round the clock, and the prizes are not only territory, ports, and raw materials but more importantly the hearts, minds, and souls of men.

Given the object lesson of the Kremlin's diabolical program, seeing how far and menacingly the confiscatory hand of the Politburo reaches, viewing the spiritual ruin and the dehumanized end products of Soviet nihilism, one can say in all truth and sincerity that he is thankful to God that we have a campaign of truth, and that the Voice of America is on the spiritual firing line.

Whatever may come in the way of cessation of hostilities in Korea, and we all fervently wish for an early and constructive solution of that problem whose toll has been heavy but unavoidable—whatever, I say may come of the negotiations, let us not for a moment delude ourselves that the fundamental issues between Russian nihilism and the western world have been adjusted.

If the guns should be silenced in Korea, we have every expectation that elsewhere throughout the world, the Soviet war of propaganda will continue unabated, and dangerous tensions will be blown up to the near-breaking point; it is almost a certainty that if quiet envelops the Korean front, the Soviet war of words will be continued in other theaters with renewed fury.

We ignore only at our own peril the fact that the Soviets employ propaganda as a major instrument of policy both internally and externally. Over the bloody years of the forties, and in this already war-inflicted decade, dictators have shown that in many instances propaganda is more deadly than armament.

To realize how important the campaign of truth is to the preservation of western civilization, and as a vital arm in America's crusade of peace through freedom, one has only to think of the vast prison the Russian Empire has become, to dwell for a moment on the plight of the imprisoned souls in that spiritual and intellectual dungeon.

We must never cease trying to get the sunlight of truth to those poor people; we must never abandon them to the deadly fare of the lie, of inspired hate, to calculated distortions all of which degrade man and soil him in the sight of his Creator. To reach these prisoners we need the Voice of America.

By words and deeds we must go on showing our allies abroad that America is aroused in power spiritually and physically so as to restore situations of strength that will give the Soviet marauder pause—and we must register the conviction with the free world and others that if a resort of arms finally becomes necessary, the people of the United States will stand unflinchingly until the dread evil of Soviet aggression is destroyed. To carry on this effort of persuasion and conviction we need a strong Voice of America.

To the captive peoples of the satellite countries we must continue to bring, as the Voice of America is now doing, words of hope and encouragement and assurance; messages which will revive old memories and stir new hopes. Not the least dastardly and nefarious technique of Soviet nihilism is that it not only cancels out the future for the individual but it systematically and unmercifully destroys the past. Is it any wonder then that its unlucky victims, caught up in its spiritual void, so often yearn for the deliverance of death. Through the Voice of America we can sustain these innocent victims in hope.

The challenge we face is an unscrupulous enemy who seeks to transform the world of civilization into a jungle land populated with dehumanized automata. Be sure of it, Mr. Chairman, the

Soviets have generated something base and terribly evil. They deny man the promptings of his soul, they befoul his intellect, they corrupt his values, they achieve if you please a metaphysical crisis until the victim is so confused, so mentally perverted, so at war with himself, so murderous of his finer self that liberation through the blind fury of physical destructiveness is a device eagerly embraced. Thus are legions of war indoctrinated and mobilized, thus are satellite countries crucified on crosses of their national honor, thus are increasing numbers of human beings converted into Soviet units for conquest.

This is the enemy, Mr. Chairman. Against him, planes and bombs and tanks are not enough. Armament is necessary, and in great numbers, and accelerated production for total preparedness must be our keynote, but when all this is done and accomplished, I submit, Mr. Chairman, the job is only partly finished—with equal urgency we require the means to command the spiritual, intellectual and cultural firepower necessary to meet and defeat Soviet propaganda.

That is why we need a Voice of America that is ever stronger and more penetrating.

You ask me: "How about the Voice? Is it getting through the iron curtain?" The answer, gentlemen, is an emphatic "Yes!" Yes, the Voice is getting through and this despite the ambitious efforts of the Soviets to keep it out.

From the far reaches of the Baltic to the Pacific outpost of Vladivostok, from the sunny climes of Sevastopol to cold Murmansk, the Voice of America is getting through to the Russian people.

It is not for idle amusement that the politburo has ordered round-the-clock jamming behind the iron curtain to keep out the Voice of America. The concentrated, organized effort of the Kremlin to silence the Voice is the greatest possible tribute it could be paid. The truth hurts where the main traffic is in lies.

Does anyone doubt the Voice of America is hitting hard in the campaign of truth? Eloquent evidence of its telling effectiveness is to be found in the pages of Pravda, which reacts quickly and frequently with violence when the Voice has scored a hit; it is to be found in the testimony of defectors who have been fortunate to flee the captivity of the iron-curtain prison; it is to be had from American Embassy officials; yes, the Voice is being heard in all parts of Russia and throughout the satellite countries.

As we consider the matter of funds for the campaign of truth, it is pertinent for us to remind ourselves that last December 20 Czechoslovakia passed a law for the defense of peace which provides for penalties of from 1 to 10 years in jail for spreading "warmongering news," or "propaganda." Certainly such legislative action speaks volumes for the effectiveness of the Voice.

For a moment let us turn to Bulgaria from which country we have the written statement that employees of Radio Sofia base openly admitted that their station has fewer listeners than the Voice of America.

Again, Reuters News Agency, after a survey, is responsible for the statement that in Hungary "No one who can possibly help it ever misses the Voice of America." It is worthy of especial comment that in Hungary and Bulgaria the Communist regimes have enacted measures which look to sweeping regulations pointed at listeners to the Voice of America.

Everywhere signs are multiplying that frontiers of freedom are being extended as the Voice of America gets through.

By your own knowledge you are aware that the Voice currently is making a great political capital by asking in its broadcasts why Stalin does not publish in Russia Congress' message of friendship to the Russian people. This constitutes a real poser for the Kremlin and the people who are hearing the Voice in Russia cannot help wondering why Stalin refuses to make the declaration of friendship public. And word travels quickly behind the iron curtain.

In just recent days, the Voice has been an effective instrument in exposing the unfair tactics of the Communists in the Kaesong negotiations, just as on June 6 it taunted Malik to declare himself unequivocally on peace in Korea.

The Voice of America constantly has told the facts on the Oatis case as it has attacked the Hungarian Communist regime on this "legal" farce.

It is an impressive report, Mr. Chairman, which shows that the Voice in the prior fiscal year increased its foreign-language programs from 29 to 46; in the last month, 6 new programs have been started and now the Voice is going into Stalin's home balivick, Georgia.

You will be interested, I know, to learn that the Voice headquarters in this country now receives approximately 1,000 letters a day from listeners abroad, the vast majority of them attesting to its great worth, many of them containing constructive criticism, and not a few of them smuggled, probably at the risk of death, from behind the iron curtain.

I would ask you to remember, gentlemen, that the Voice of America is in itself only one phase of the many-sided campaign of truth, which has been well characterized as an "American insurance plan to try to prevent world chaos."

The campaign of truth is responsible for the establishment of United States information centers in 132 cities throughout the world, one recently having been closed in Budapest. Those centers are supplied with news, books, magazines, leaflets, maps, special exhibits. The International Motion Picture Division issuing the valuable medium of the film to tell our story in far-flung places. Motion picture experts are turning out a variety of films which are bringing the American Story to millions in an interesting, entertaining, and convincing way. In many areas of the globe, this is adjudged one of the most telling ways in which to get our story across.

Not to ply you with statistics but it is part of this campaign of truth story that the International Press and Publications Division produces news, feature materials, and pictures which reach more than 10,000 foreign newspapers and periodicals with an estimated readership of

90,000,000 people. The Wireless Bulletin issued by this division, and which is monitored by 60 of our diplomatic missions in many parts of the world, is a fast-moving news service which is produced in four editions for Europe, the Near East, Latin America, and the Far East. For the most part, each bulletin runs about 7,000 words. After it has been translated into the local language it is made available by our information service offices to foreign press agencies and newspapers. So again, is the American Story dramatically and tellingly unfolded.

Supplementing this unique information service is a 10-page Air Bulletin that is sent out twice a week; also forwarded are special articles and magazine reprints from 250 American magazines; and by technical newsletters and pamphlets which provide basic information about the United States.

You gentlemen should be told that last year the Office of Information and Educational Exchange, the over-all title of these various functions we are discussing, printed and distributed 4,946,380 booklets and leaflets. This year output was increased to 50,250,000. This year some 50,200,000 posters have been distributed, carrying the free world theme. The figures show also that last year, the libraries conducted under this program were visited by more than 24,000,000 persons seeking the truth about the United States, and honest information about the world in which we live.

A very important part of the operations we are here considering is the exchange of persons program. Last year nearly 7,000 persons were exchanged with 56 foreign countries. This program has been found most effective in building world understanding.

Through the private enterprise unit activities many worth-while programs are stimulated and carried through to successful conclusion through the enlightened cooperation of American business and industry. Public-spirited book publishers have made thousands of textbook remainders available to the program; books, pamphlets, and magazines have been made available; and 48 State governments have given 283,000 booklets for distribution. Cultural affiliation has been a very profitable activity for us in winning friends and understanding of our way of life; the town affiliation program has brought notable results in international amity and progress. The letters from America campaign continues to grow in volume and influence.

So in virtually every conceivable form and way, the campaign of truth has progressed notably. I would be unfair to myself, Mr. Chairman, and to everything I cherish in life and my credo as an American who believes in man as a creature of God, endowed with inalienable rights, if I did not, at this crucial time, speak with all the force and sincerity I can summon in behalf of a strong and effective campaign of truth.

Speculate for a moment, if you will, upon the gross economic product of America and make a mental calculation of the substantial sums, reaching into the tens of millions, that are spent advertising those products to potential cus-

tomers, and then compare those figures with the money that is herewith requested to advertise the greatest product America has to sell to the world: the story of American democracy, its works and achievement. By any measurement of good business practice, you can readily see that we fall short of what the trade would call an adequate budget.

It is only too well known that one of the wishes entertained in the Kremlin is that America, in her heroic response to the growing threat of Soviet expansionism, will so weaken herself that economic collapse will ensue and the international Communist conspiracy for world mastery will be realized by default. None of us here in this Chamber wants to be profligate with public funds; we are aware that unwarranted expenditures from the National Treasury only help the enemy. Prudence and caution must be our guides in appropriating funds; now having said this, I also say that it would be an equally serious error to indulge in unsound economy in this vital matter.

For my part, I would favor a greatly expanded appropriation. I am firm in the conviction that more funds than are herein contemplated could be spent wisely and profitably in the campaign of truth, and to the advantage of America and the free world. Certainly when we consider the need and effectiveness of this program and then compare it with the expenditures for outright armaments, I contend we have seriously short-changed ourselves. All of you are aware, I am sure, that the politburo elevates propaganda to such a level of importance that Russia is outspending us in money, output and volume by a ratio of about 5 to 1 in this realm. And you may be sure that such would not be the case unless the masters of the Kremlin were convinced such activities paid off handsomely for their side.

But be that as it may, and sacrificing my personal desires in the matter, the fact remains that we are here confronted with a bill that makes provision for what I consider a minimum program. I would prefer much more and am certain I could make out a firm case for a higher figure, but certainly I will never agree to anything less than the committee has authorized.

Just so I am equally certain that my worthy colleagues of the committee who have wrestled long and earnestly with this matter—and we have had our strenuous but honest differences of opinion—are equally set that to cut below this total of \$85,000,000 would be a mistake of the first magnitude.

What I am doing, then, Mr. Chairman, is making a virtue of necessity and advocating a course of procedure which I am convinced is inadequate, but one which I now realize is practically necessitous.

Just for a moment, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, dwell on the mighty epic of integrity, idealism, sweat and honest labor, ingenuity, and great aspiring that go into the making of the American dream—all of which spell freedom.

Dwell then for the sake of contrast on the outrageous things that are being

done in the name of Soviet expansionism: Naked aggression, the organized attack to drive God out of men's lives, the forced labor camps, the mock trials, the uprooting of families, with the attendant cruelties this forced exodus visits upon the very young and the aged—all of which spell slavery.

Think of those two pictures, speculate upon the kind of a world we will have in, say, 1984 or 1964, dependent upon which system prevails; consider that words are weapons in the hands of the enemy, then consult your conscience, and vote.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a place in this cold war for a sound and sensible Voice of America program. I am satisfied that at the present time the cut provided in the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Ohio is reasonable; \$70,000,000 is sufficient until the program is reorganized. I want to bring to bear in support of my position part of a radio broadcast which was made by Henry J. Taylor from Switzerland just last Monday evening. I think it is very important because he discussed this matter of the Voice program.

He goes on to point out that the people of Europe know that the United States is not militaristic; that we are not over there to acquire territory. But he points out that they are worried about something we may do to stir up a war. Let me read just part of what he says:

This brings me then to the main question worrying the Swiss—the same question I found worrying many leaders in Britain and France. Informed European leaders know America is not imperialistic. * * * They know that American defense is, in fact, not only the defense of America but the intensive defense of the free world. In short, they do know that the intention of the United States is honestly and truly defensive.

"But," they ask, "does Stalin know it?" They say whether Stalin knows this or not is the main risk of war. The great worry among leaders I have talked with is that Stalin may confuse the United States of today with the Germany of the past. Once our arms are built up, once our ships are out of mothballs, and our soldiers trained, our tanks and artillery out of the factories, our airplanes standing on the airfields—does Stalin think he is going to be attacked the —like he was finally attacked by Hitler after Hitler finally got ready?

Stalin certainly does not understand America even as little as we understand Russia. He probably has no understandable idea why the United States went into the last war—Russia, under same conditions, would not have done so. In short, the American nature is probably a greater puzzle to Stalin than his nature is to us.

So come, for a moment, to the Kremlin itself. If you or I could ask Stalin one question—and could perform the magic of getting an honest answer—here is the overriding question we should ask: "Generalissimo Stalin, in your ignorance of America, have you made up your mind that in the long run, sooner or later, the United States will attack you, when America's arms are built up, as Germany attacked you when Germany was ready?" For if Stalin thinks that when we get all dressed up we are, in any case, going some place, and that the some place we are going is against him, he

will try to beat us to the punch—if punch it is to be.

In such mistaken idea by Stalin of America long-term intention, European leaders see any main possibility of a new world war.

Accordingly, many are alarmed by much they hear broadcast over here by the official Voice of America—the official radio program of our own State Department. It is constantly baiting Stalin, addressing broadcasts to him personally with great violence, taunting him, calling him a coward and a bluffer, and everything else. When I hear it much of its sounds to me like Nazi Goebbels talking directly to Stalin in language about as violent as Goebbels ever used.

European leaders are against appeasement. They don't like Stalin any better than we do. But they're also against what sounds to them like belligerence—absolute out-and-out belligerence by the United States. And if the Voice of America sounds like that to them, how must it sound to Stalin? Stalin will go to war, or not go to war, depending on what he thinks about his own future. To broadcast to him in language, tones and words like Goebbels did—and for all Russia to hear—is a profoundly important dangerous blunder. It contains within itself the disastrous possibility that Stalin may figure it's his neck anyway that we're after—and if it's going to be war from us sooner or later, as it was from Nazi Germany, he'd better beat us to the punch, for he would have less to lose by doing so, than by waiting until we got all built up and hit him first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have spent 2 days on this particular bill in general debate. There are a few people who want to be heard under the 5-minute rule. We want to finish the bill today. I am not going to object to the gentleman having one additional minute, but I do feel constrained to object to any other extension of time during the discussion of this bill under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin—

And thus it could upset our whole assumption over here, namely, that Stalin is unwilling to risk all-out war, and that's why you'll find so many thoughtful Europeans actually more alarmed at this moment about America than about Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this time we cannot agree upon some limitation of debate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes. Otherwise, I shall have to object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to any such request.

The CHAIRMAN. No request has been made yet.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman was wondering. I was just putting an end to the wondering.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know what the gentleman from Minnesota is so worried about, but it is all right with me.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We want sufficient time to discuss this matter.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not want to shut off anybody, but I think we should have some limitation of debate on this particular amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. After all, there is \$15,000,000 involved in this amendment. It should be worth a little of our time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I made a statement on the floor that the Soviet Union was spending between one and two billion dollars each year for propaganda purposes, the objective of which is to undermine the resistance to Communist domination in different nations, and the ultimate objective of dominating and enslaving all the peoples of the world. In connection with that I wish to call to the attention of the members of the committee that Jack McCloy, the High Commissioner in Germany, estimated that they are spending \$500,000,000 a year in Germany alone. I know that Jack McCloy is very highly regarded by many Members of this House and his opinion is certainly powerful evidence.

In North Korea we find that they had enrolled 1,300,000 Koreans in Soviet-Korean cultural societies.

In 1949 alone they translated into Korean and published some 500 Russian books. Of two of these books alone it has been found that they distributed 537,000 copies. Almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given in North Korea by Soviet artists, writers, and others in 1 year.

In the Eightieth Congress there were set up two advisory commissions of distinguished citizens to study this program and report to the Congress semiannually on the progress of the program. Who are they? Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and that is a very sound, progressive union; there is no communism there.

Harold Willis Dodds, president of Princeton University.

Edwin B. Fred, president of the University of Wisconsin.

Martin R. P. McGuire, president of Catholic University.

There is the membership, and their report issued only a short while ago is one of commendation of the work being done by those in charge of this program. There is, of course, no such thing as perfection; there is no such thing as a perfect human being; I am not perfect; none of us is perfect, and you cannot have perfection; but there is the report they give to the Congress of the United States.

Here is the United States Advisory Commission on Information. They issue a very fine report saying this program is being efficiently administered, that its personnel has been greatly improved and is being steadily enriched by specialists of larger experience and talent; that the expansion authorized by the Eighty-first Congress as the campaign of truth is being effectively carried forward. Who are the men who

make up this Commission? Let me read their names:

The Radio Advisory Committee which consists of the following persons: Judge Justin Miller, chairman of the board of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, and member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University.

Wesley I. Dumm, president, Associated Broadcasters, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

Donley F. Feddersen, president, University Association for Professional Radio Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Jack W. Harris, general manager, Station KPRC, Houston, Tex.

Henry P. Johnston, general manager, Station WSGN, Birmingham, Ala.

Edward Noble, chairman of the board, American Broadcasting Co.

John F. Patt, president, Station WGAR, Cleveland, Ohio.

Meffort R. Runyon, executive vice president, American Cancer Society.

G. Richard Shafto, general manager, Station WIS, Columbia, S. C.

Hugh B. Terry, vice president and general manager, Station KLZ, Denver, Colo.

The general business advisory committee, which consists of the following persons:

Philip D. Reed, chairman—and member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

James A. Farley, chairman of the board, Coca-Cola Export Corp.

Ralph T. Reed, president, American Express Co.

W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of the executive committee, National City Bank of New York.

Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc., advertising.

William M. Robbins, vice president for overseas operations, General Foods Corp.

David A. Shepard, executive assistant, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

J. P. Spang, Jr., president, Gillette Safety Razor Co.

Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp.

Warren Lee Pierson, chairman of the board, Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

The work of the Ideological Committee is devoted to the consideration of special projects and participants in the work of this rotating committee are persons with outstanding experience in the field under study. Each meeting will consist of a new group of specialists. The first group of such specialists were: George Gallup, Institute of Public Opinion.

George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Allen W. Dulles, director and president, Council on Foreign Relations.

Elmer Davis, news analyst, American Broadcasting Co.

Alexander Inkeles, Harvard University.

Now let us see what the policy of the Soviet Union is in the battle of minds on the ideological level. The Soviets have stated that there can be no breathing space in the ideological warfare. Pravda, which speaks the policy of the Soviet Union, in an item dated the 22d of June 1946, said:

On the ideological front we must and shall fight not by passive resistance but by active and increasing attack on the enemies. This is what the writing of Lenin and Stalin teaches; this is in accordance with our traditions.

One further observation: I exhibit before you posters used by the Soviets in their propaganda villifying America and exalting the Soviet Union.

The committee has already reduced this item by \$30,000,000. It would seem to me that an additional reduction of \$15,000,000 would be unwise. I hope the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Clevenger amendment to reduce the funds for the Voice of America. I am constrained to be considerably skeptical of all the rosy claims that are being made for this propaganda medium.

Propaganda of this sort is a delicate weapon, and its merit is hard to appraise. I have asked many people at random how they feel about propaganda of foreign nations in this country. In every case, they have replied either that they resent it or that it irritates them.

Consequently, I am inclined to wonder why there is so much confidence in the idea that other peoples will not be resentful or irritated by our propagandas. Are they a different type of humans?

The instructed-witness testimonials of the State Department concerning the effectiveness of the Voice of America leave me cold. I am much more inclined to be impressed by a survey recently conducted among 293 seniors at Silliman University High School in the Philippine Islands, as reported in a recent issue of the Christian Century.

That survey revealed that only 46 percent of these students believed that America is more concerned for the welfare of the peoples of the world than are the Russians.

With a statement that Russia is "an imperialistic nation which hides its greed for land and power by pretending to be a friend of the common man," only 47 percent agreed.

It was the opinion of 45 percent of the students that Russia would have done more for the Philippines if she had been in power there for the past two decades.

It was the belief of 45 percent that religious denominations are not prohibited from holding services in Russia, and of 55 percent, that more than one party was represented in Russian elections.

The foregoing record of the results of the Voice of America as it has performed in the Philippines is disillusioning, to say the least.

We have controlled the Philippines for five decades. We have spent hundreds of millions there, and we have many other advantages in our propa-

ganda efforts with them. Yet, the foregoing survey reveals that our propaganda, especially the Voice of America, could be called a substantial flop in influencing the thinking of those people.

While this is but one piece of evidence, it is much more credible than a dozen of the instructed-witness testimonials of the State Department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to report to the House about a recent experience of mine with the State Department, an experience which constrains me to support every effort to bring under control the reckless operations in that Department of the Government.

You all recall the contents of the State Department Formosa policy document, an official propaganda instruction sheet outlining tactics filled with deceit and double talk.

Following the revelation of that document, I sought from the State Department a list of the titles of similar Information Service guidances issued in 1950 and 1951.

It seemed reasonable to me that a Member of Congress might well inform himself a bit in this field after the shocking details of the Formosa paper.

I did not ask for the policy papers themselves. All I sought was a list of titles of such propaganda papers, so that I might have at least an inkling of what the State Department is doing in this field.

I was turned down with some pious phrases about the material being classified and confidential.

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the proposition that sometimes material of this kind should be classified and confidential.

But I submit to the House that it is a highly unsatisfactory and unsound situation when a Member of Congress, representing the people of America, cannot get to see even the titles of propaganda directives by the State Department.

I suggest that the people would rather trust any and all Members of Congress in preference to any of the pinks, punks, and perverts that have been found nesting in the State Department.

The American people have lost confidence in the management of the State Department, and rightly so.

This is the same State Department that carried out unlimited collaboration with Russia during and after World War II. Until there is a house cleaning in that Department the American people are in constant peril. They are in the hands of a State Department that reeks with incompetence, or worse, in many of its branches.

That fact that it can, by unlimited propaganda, confuse and bewilder the Congress to the point where no effective clean-up is required, is a frightening phenomenon, and a menace to our system of Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15, the last 15 minutes to be reserved to the committee and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman's motion is not in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the latter part of the motion and move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 84, noes 43.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of the time be allotted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we are up to mischief or not in reducing the appropriation for the Voice of America. I was impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. I agree that a billion dollars is not too much to pay for a good informational service. There was a time when I was a friend of the Voice of America and took pleasure in defending it. Referring to it some time ago, I made the statement that after Mr. Benton left the State Department that the Voice of America lapsed back into the sorry state that it had previously occupied. That statement, I am convinced, did an injustice to Mr. Barrett, and I wish to withdraw it. Mr. Barrett, I am confident, is an excellent gentleman and is doing his best to do a good job. His difficulty, in my opinion, is that it is impossible for him to do a good job in the atmosphere of the State Department in which he is operating. Freed of this influence will afford to multiply the appropriation here proposed a half dozen times.

What the country needs, badly needs, is the cleaning out of that Department, and it needs it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish we could have a strong Voice of America, one to which we could point with pride. The difficulty, I think, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], is that some of the personnel presently in the Department are not of the quality or caliber to give us a good program.

Six months before the Korean war broke out I was in Seoul. I had the opportunity there of listening to the Voice of America on two different occasions. I blushed with shame. I am sure every Member in this Chamber would have felt the voice did not represent America. It was not the Voice of America that I wanted to hear. I wanted to crawl away some place and apologize for it. I want a real strong, honest voice that gets results.

I was in England when the voice of the old OWI under Elmer Davis was operating, and that was no good.

Some of that propaganda they put out is very much like the material I received this morning in the mail from the Office of Price Stabilization. It is being sent out over my district. It is this "Mike at the dike" from the Pendergast machine in Missouri telling us what to do about inflation.

We have the domestic voice of inflation and the Voice of America. This is a part of the propaganda. It is similar to some of the Voice of America propaganda that is put out at the present time.

By propaganda we try to influence people, we try to influence nations. We use any method we can. I suppose if it is good propaganda I like it. If you do not like it, it does not please you. But I say to you that unless we can change the personnel, and that goes from the top in the State Department right down to the lower levels, some of the individuals who presently are handling the Voice of America and the policies of this country, the Voice of America ought to be given a decent burial. There are plenty of red-blooded patriotic Americans to fill positions of trust. There is no need to employ those of questionable reputation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the younger Members of this distinguished body, I do not often take the floor, but the Voice of America is a subject on which I have deep convictions.

The major tobacco companies of this country spent almost fifty-one million last year advertising 30-day smoking tests, your T zone, and not a cough in a carload, and yet we have men here opposing telling that story of the greatest thing ever created by the minds and hearts of men, American democracy. Millions spent to advertise cigarettes, and we hesitate to spend \$85,000,000 to tell the world of democracy—it just does not make sense.

America is a country of supersalesmen. We have developed advertising and salesmanship of our merchandise beyond any other nation. We are the best vendors in the world, but when it comes to selling our way of life we have just scratched the surface. People in foreign lands know the taste of Coca-Cola; let us also tell them about freedom of religion, a free press, the integrity and dignity of the individual, a Government in which the state serves its people and not the citizens serving as slaves to the state.

When it comes to selling toothpaste, soap, and, yes, even dog food, no one can compete with us.

But too long we have been content with the platitude, "That these things we hold to be self-evident," when we think of democracy. Self-evident to freemen, yes, but not to those who read and listen to a censored press and radio. It is these people who must be reached. They must be told the true story of the United States. The Voice of America is an effective way of telling them.

This is a relatively new agency with an immense task before it. As all large businesses or Government agencies new to their jobs, it has undoubtedly made mistakes and could be improved in its services. The opponents to this appropriation would be rendering the Nation a service by taking a position of telling how its functions can be improved, but the only position most have taken is one of opposition.

The Russians have become masters of propaganda. They have become so adept at telling the big lie often enough, that many of the world's people have swallowed the Communist line awakening too late to do much about it. We have only to look on our competitors to see the effectiveness of propaganda. Since the end of World War II, the slave masters of the Kremlin have extended their domination over the people of the world from 200,000,000 people to over 800,000,000, without doing battle.

The world is faced with a basic clash of doctrines. This is a battle for the minds of men.

I heard an opponent of this appropriation yesterday say the kind of democracy he believed in was one backed by the military might of America. Certainly such armed might is necessary and I have always voted for such appropriations. But perhaps those men would also like to join in the song Old Soldiers Never Die, but there are those of us who remember that young soldiers do. It is their lives that will be at stake if we lose this battle of communism versus democracy, the young will die in battle. The young men of this country stand ready to make any sacrifice for their Nation. But, we, as their representatives, should neglect no effort to try to avoid that sacrifice.

Winning this battle for the minds of men is just as important as a victory on the battlefield. It results in fewer Gold Star Mothers.

I will never be one who will overlook a chance to defeat the Communists in the fight of the big truth against the big lie. Win nations by telling them the truth, break through the propaganda shroud of the Kremlin, then the battle is won without firing a shot.

The bill for advertising the true story of democracy—of reaching those minds behind the iron curtain, helping stir revolution against dictators—is less than the price of our latest aircraft carrier. Must we, the most progressive nation in the world, depend entirely on brawn and neglect brains in this fight to defeat communism?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this was truly the Voice of America, I personally would vote \$200,000,000 for it, if that much could be advantageously expended to counteract Soviet propaganda. But I am disturbed over what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others have informed us to the lack of constructive efforts by the group in control of this

program. I voted for the establishment of this program several years ago but I feel that it is more than a waste of money to approve the present operations.

Just study the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TALLER] of the other day and you will see the details. Let us keep this in mind. Even with this cut we are asking here this group will still have more money than they had available for the very same purposes for the fiscal year 1951—that is, if you do not take into consideration the construction money which was made available in supplemental appropriations and other appropriations in 1951. Why should we in all good common sense give this group more money than this past fiscal year and thus approve the job which they have not done by increasing the amount of money appropriated for them. I hope the Clevenger amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will we ever understand that we are in a war—partially hot in Korea and partially cold? This modern cold war emergency consists of three parts; military, economic, and ideological. This is the ideological phase we are debating here. We are probably going to vote \$60,000,000,000 for arms without batting an eye, and here we are trying to cut the heart out of this appropriation for a correlative element of our defense which the Subcommittee on Appropriations has already cut very materially. Certainly if this was a Voice of America program doing the full job that needs to be done we would vote it \$3,000,000,000.

It is not a complete ideological program and has many deficiencies but does that mean we have to shut it down and cripple it completely? It is analogous to me, to shutting down 20 percent of the power and light plant in your community because you do not like the management.

I, too, want a separate establishment for the foreign information program as does Senator BENTON. I want many other things, and I am going to fight for them. But in the meantime the Russians are stopping with their ideological warfare and we cannot stop here.

Mr. Chairman, what are a few of the things we are doing with this \$85,000,000? Just to show you how very little you can do with \$85,000,000—and if you cut it you will do even less than this inadequate amount—is the following:

Radio broadcasts—Voice of America—of 3 hours in Russian, 1½ hours to each of the Soviet's European satellites, 4 hours to China, and one-half hour each to India, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia;

Publication of less than 1 pamphlet, leaflet, or poster for each 15 persons in the free world;

Production of one 1-hour motion picture program every 2 weeks;

Translation of an average of less than 11 important and politically effective books into the languages of 30 countries, each of them vital to our defense effort;

Bringing to this country an average of about eight influential public opinion leaders from each of the free countries of the world; and

The operation of a world-wide news service, reading room, and general information program with an average of less than one American abroad for every million and a half persons in the free world.

I call your attention to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] just read to you of what the Russians did in one place—in North Korea—alone. I was going to read the same thing. Just compare the magnitude of that propaganda effort in only one country with our whole information job. That is the competition we must meet.

General Eisenhower said in his address to the Congress in February last that we need a strong Voice of America, "a very much stronger information service."

A private businessman like Cass Canfield, chairman of the board of Harper & Bros., writes to me as follows:

I am familiar with the State Department's book program. I think it is well administered, and feel very strongly now that it would be a great mistake to cut it below the modest amount expended in 1951.

That would mean retaining the committee's amount in the bill.

In view of what we are voting for arms, I ask you whether you want to tie our hands behind our backs just for the sake of this short-sighted kind of economy to save \$15,000,000 on a program vital to the national defense which the subcommittee has already cut \$30,000,000. I am for encouraging the subcommittee and not for crippling our own efforts in the ideological field in the grim struggle against communism by this kind of short-sighted economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSER].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to testify rather than to make a speech.

A few years ago it was my privilege, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, to visit a number of countries and the Arabian oil fields where four American companies, known as the Arabian-American Oil Co., had gone in as private industry, without a dime of subsidy, drilled wells and constructed a pipeline across to the Mediterranean, making the outlet several thousand miles closer.

There we talked, not the State Department, about whom disparaging reference has been made time and again, but rugged, hard-fisted American businessmen, representing free enterprises, at its best.

May I pause for a moment to say that I do not subscribe to some of the remarks that have been made because the Ambassadors that we found in the countries we visited, men like Allen, in Iran; Dunn, in Italy; Douglas MacArthur, and his superior in Paris; and several others were

all capable Americans. Their cry stands out in my memory above everything else, "Get us the Voice of America into these countries. The Russian propaganda is pouring in. What we need more than anything else is a true story of America through the Voice of America."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I took this time for the reason that in listening to the debate during the last 2 days I noted that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had given testimony from lists of the higher-salaried employees in the State Department in categories which he himself had placed them in for the purpose of his discussion. I also notice that the Record for the last day does not show those lists and the gentleman did not incorporate them. I take this time today to ask our colleague [Mr. STEFAN] if he has any objection to putting those lists in the Record at this point.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any special purpose that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. WERDEL. The special purpose I have in mind is that I believe the expanding nature of this budget is such that the Members have difficulty in understanding it unless they remain here on the floor. I think in the future, for this year and next year, it would be to the interest of all of us to turn to this part of the Record and look at the names of those gentlemen who handling the high-salaried jobs in the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that every one of the names in the State Department is included in the budget?

Mr. WERDEL. I am well aware of that. However, they are not categorized as the gentleman from Nebraska has done in connection with his remarks.

Mr. STEFAN. I have already had permission to extend my remarks and include such material. There is quite a voluminous list. The only list I have is in the office of the Secretary. Would the gentleman be satisfied to list those in the higher brackets?

Mr. WERDEL. Just in the higher brackets; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Then I will place those in the Record at this point, under the permission previously given me.

Mr. WERDEL. I thank the gentleman.

The list referred to follows:

Office of the Secretary

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Dean Acheson		\$22,500
William D. Pawley	GS-15	11,000
Bromley K. Smith	GS-15	10,500
Marshall D. Shulman	GS-14	8,800
Lucius D. Battle	GS-13	8,600
Barbara Evans	GS-13	7,600
George William Foster	GS-13	7,600
Mildred J. Asbjornson	GS-11	5,000
Esther C. Grab	GS-11	5,000
Dorothy H. Morgret	GS-9	4,850
Mary L. Meyer	GS-7	4,200
Marie A. Benda	GS-6	3,825
Sara Nell Gregg	GS-5	3,475

Office of the Secretary—Continued

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Ellen E. Burton.....	GS-5.....	\$3,225
Katherine Gurnett.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Anita W. Pawley.....	GS-4.....	2,875
William J. Kelly.....	GS-3.....	3,130
James R. Warren.....	GS-3.....	3,130
James Thomas Payne.....	CPC-4.....	2,770
George T. Eades.....	CPC-3.....	2,732
Total (20).....		124,887

Policy planning staff and counselor

Name	Grade	Annual rate
George F. Kennan.....		\$15,000
Paul H. Nitze.....	GS-18.....	14,000
Walter Thurston.....	GS-15.....	13,500
Henry Villard.....	GS-15.....	13,200
Dorothy Fosdick.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Robert G. Hooker, Jr.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Carlton Savage.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Lampton Berry.....	GS-15.....	10,700
John Davies, Jr.....	GS-15.....	10,000
John H. Ferguson.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Charles B. Marshall.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Robert W. Tufts.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Philip H. Watts.....	GS-11.....	5,600
Alice May Harvey.....	GS-9.....	4,725
Dorothy M. Hessman.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Helen C. Allison.....	GS-7.....	4,325
Velma A. Heine.....	GS-6.....	4,075
Amelia H. Allen.....	GS-6.....	3,825
Elizabeth N. Kosciw.....	GS-6.....	3,825
Maryl H. Woolford.....	GS-6.....	3,700
Jean Bryan.....	GS-6.....	3,700
Naomi Rene Sutphin.....	GS-6.....	3,575
Adele B. Slama.....	GS-6.....	3,450
Shirley B. Goodman.....	GS-5.....	3,725
Martha K. Pritting.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Nancy H. Matthews.....	CPC-4.....	2,752
Lloyd Morarity.....		
Total (27).....		204,152

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Jack K. McFall.....		\$15,000
Ben H. Brown, Jr.....	GS-16.....	11,200
Florence Kirlin.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Philander P. Claxton, Jr.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Horace H. Smith.....	GS-15.....	10,700
Allen B. Moreland.....	GS-15.....	10,000
George O. Gray.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Louise White.....	GS-13.....	8,400
Clara G. McMillan.....	GS-13.....	7,600
William H. Dodderidge.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Edith V. Mamish.....	GS-9.....	5,100
Bennie Mae Stevens.....	GS-9.....	5,100
B. Beatrice Ruffin.....	GS-9.....	4,725
Mary M. Walker.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Florence Grendon.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Annette F. Vollmer.....	GS-7.....	3,950
Milrae E. Jensen.....	GS-7.....	3,825
George Winnett, Jr.....	GS-7.....	3,825
Louise Hines.....	GS-6.....	4,075
Ruth I. Flisinger.....	GS-6.....	3,700
Mary Ann Sames.....	GS-6.....	3,450
Norma Griffin.....	GS-5.....	3,475
Helen McAllister.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Barbara E. Mason.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Curtis A. White.....	CPC-4.....	2,770
James O. Holland.....	CPC-3.....	2,412
Total (26).....		161,857

Office of the Ambassador at Large

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Philip C. Jessup.....		\$25,000
Walter N. Walmsley.....	GS-15.....	10,700
Max W. Bishop.....	GS-15.....	10,330
E. Vernice Anderson.....	GS-11.....	5,600
M. Teresa Beach.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Carmen C. Crickman.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Sammie M. Venable.....	GS-7.....	4,325
Debbie R. Guiler.....	GS-6.....	3,475
Jo Ann Mintz.....	GS-4.....	3,115
Robert Hill, Jr.....	GS-4.....	2,450
Total (10).....		74,170

Salaries and expenses, Department of State, Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs

Name	Grade	Salary
Office of the Assistant Secretary:		
Dean Rusk.....	Unclassified.....	\$15,000
Livingston T. Merchant.....	GS-17.....	12,200
John K. Emmerson.....	GS-15.....	10,330
Merrill C. Gay.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Samuel T. Parelman.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Ruth E. Bacon.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Philip Sullivan.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Cyrus Peake.....	GS-14.....	9,800
Robert C. Yost.....	GS-14.....	8,800
W. Gregory Hackler.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Louise McNutt.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Frances H. Rawlings.....	GS-9.....	4,850
Office of the Executive Director:		
William D. Wright.....	GS-15.....	10,700
John G. DeGooyer.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Charlton Ogburn.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Harold Waddell.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Charles A. Wade.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Solomon Silver.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Basil Capella.....	GS-13.....	8,000
Walker W. Smith.....	GS-12.....	6,400
John W. Beckwith.....	GS-12.....	7,000
Thelbert F. Taylor.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Ernest J. Hortum.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Wellington Z. Myers.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Frank P. Lockhart.....	GS-11.....	5,400
John R. Heidemann.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Roland C. Fields.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Elizabeth Hallagan.....	GS-9.....	5,225
Ruth Kelly.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Robert Johnson.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Office of Chinese Affairs:		
Oliver E. Clubb.....	GS-15.....	12,400
Troy L. Perkins.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Robert W. Barnett.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Leonard L. Bacon.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Wallace W. Stuart.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Kathleen C. Dougall.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Horace F. Amrine.....	GS-13.....	8,000
Ashley Guy Hope.....	GS-13.....	7,600
William O. Anderson.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Richard Johnson.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Harrison Holland.....	GS-9.....	4,725
Office of Northeast Asian Affairs:		
U. Alexis Johnson.....	GS-15.....	10,700
Robert J. C. McClurkin.....	GS-15.....	11,000
Gerald Warner.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Noel Hemmendinger.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Arthur B. Emmons III.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Robert Pearey.....	GS-14.....	8,800
C. Thayer White.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Willis Lory.....	GS-13.....	8,400
Douglas W. Overton.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Charles A. Fraleigh.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Joseph Carwell.....	GS-13.....	8,000
Edwin N. Cronk.....	GS-13.....	7,800
Selma G. Kallis.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Alice Dunning.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Henry Fralingshuysen.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Walter Trueman.....	GS-9.....	5,225
Davy H. McCall.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Office of Philippine and South-east Asian Affairs:		
William S. B. Lacy.....	GS-15.....	10,000
John F. Melby.....	GS-15.....	10,000
William M. Gibson.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Charles J. Sheban.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Kenneth P. Landon.....	GS-14.....	9,800
R. Austin Acly.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Leonard S. Tyson.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Robert E. Hoey.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Robert A. Burman.....	GS-13.....	7,600
James L. O'Sullivan.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Wymerly DeR. Coerr.....	GS-13.....	7,600
John F. Shaw.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Francis G. Jarvis.....	GS-13.....	8,200
Benjamin Bock.....	GS-12.....	6,800
Temple Wanamaker.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Dallas M. Coors.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Henry Williamson.....	GS-11.....	5,400
E. Edward Schefer.....	GS-9.....	5,350

Office of the Under Secretary (including Atomic Energy staff)

Name	Grade	Annual rate
James E. Webb.....		\$17,500
R. Gordon Arneson.....	GS-16.....	11,200
Lloyd A. Lehrbas.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Joseph A. Frank.....	GS-15.....	10,750
Graham R. Hall.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Joseph Chase.....	GS-14.....	8,800
J. Bruce Hamilton.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Robert A. Low.....	GS-13.....	7,600
David H. McKillop.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Gladys E. Schukraft.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Helen C. Dougherty.....	GS-9.....	4,975
Josephine Deskin.....	GS-8.....	4,450
Elizabeth A. Garrett.....	GS-5.....	3,475
Betty D. Bowman.....	GS-6.....	3,450

Office of the Under Secretary (including Atomic Energy staff)—Continued

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Bernice Holstein.....	GS-5.....	\$3,100
Genevieve L. West.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Daisy A. McClure.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Katherine W. Murray.....	GS-3.....	2,650
Stephen Payne.....	CPC-4.....	2,930
Truman McCray.....	CPC-4.....	2,770
Total (20).....		131,975

Office of the Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Wilbert M. Chapman.....	GS-15.....	\$10,750
Isla V. Davies.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Warren F. Looney.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Fred E. Taylor.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Dorothy G. Peacock.....	GS-6.....	3,950
Betty F. Blackwood.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Marion D. Harris.....	GS-3.....	2,810
Doris K. Orton.....	GS-3.....	2,730
Total (8).....		44,940

Office of the Science Adviser

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Joseph B. Koepfli.....	GS-15.....	\$11,000
Walter M. Rudolph.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Betty I. Wright.....	GS-5.....	3,350
Mildred L. Shaver.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Joyce A. Christie.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Total (5).....		29,475
Grand total, Office of the Under Secretary (33).....		206,390

Deputy Under Secretary

Name	Grade	Annual rate
H. Freeman Matthews.....		\$15,000
Aaron S. Brown.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Frederick E. Nolting.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Marion A. Johnston.....	GS-12.....	7,000
Ann K. Hartwell.....	GS-9.....	4,975
Audrey C. Hastings.....	GS-7.....	4,200
Altus J. Ackerman.....	GS-6.....	3,475
Richard L. Spells.....	GS-4.....	2,930
Total (8).....		57,580

Executive Secretariat, Office of the Director

Name	Grade	Annual rate
William J. McWilliams.....	GS-16.....	\$11,200
William J. Sheppard.....	GS-15.....	10,750
James Joseph Byrnes, Jr.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Austin P. Sullivan.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Walter Q. Wilgus.....	GS-14.....	8,800
Fred L. Hadsel.....	GS-13.....	7,800
Francis E. Meloy, Jr.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Vera Eileen Evans.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Robert F. Salm.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Amelia R. Kullman.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Burnita L. O'Day.....	GS-7.....	4,200
Mary W. Butler.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Jane Hunsinger.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Peggy D. Lucas.....	GS-5.....	3,100
William Farrell.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Eva Ann Levicki.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Maureen Mulqueen.....	GS-4.....	2,875
William E. Brown.....	GS-2.....	2,850
William H. Moore.....	CPC-3.....	2,412
Total (19).....		105,887

Executive Secretariat, Protocol Staff

Name	Grade	Annual rate
John F. Simmons.....	GS-15.....	\$13,500
H. Charles Spruik.....	GS-14.....	9,400
Raymond D. Muir.....	GS-14.....	9,200
Edward W. Nash.....	GS-13.....	8,000
Milton Mitchell.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Lois Allee Williams.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Mary E. Madden.....	GS-9.....	5,100
Leonice K. Bechtold.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Louise K. Nichols.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Katherine E. Larid.....	GS-7.....	4,200
Faye Bush.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Katherine L. Fenner.....	GS-7.....	3,950
Jeanette J. Megaw.....	GS-7.....	3,825
Eileen M. Layton.....	GS-6.....	3,700
Charles E. Hatten.....	GS-5.....	3,850
Ruth E. Silloway.....	GS-5.....	3,850
Katherine Carl Hayden.....	GS-5.....	3,725
Ann B. Boling.....	GS-5.....	3,350
Marjorie C. Regan.....	GS-5.....	3,350
Harriette S. Sliver.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Ruth Speakman.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Nola C. Hrenchir.....	GS-4.....	3,275
Elsie J. E. Nurni.....	GS-4.....	3,275
Eula M. Thompson.....	GS-4.....	3,115
Patricia M. Herbert.....	GS-4.....	2,875
D. Marie Fitzpatrick.....	GS-3.....	2,890
Total (26).....		125,905

Executive Secretariat, Policy Reports Staff

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Robert G. Barnes.....	GS-15.....	\$10,000
Jeffrey C. Kitchen.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Melvin L. Manfull.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Robert M. Berry.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Stuart Blow.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Robert C. F. Gordon.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Florence Jeanne Wilson.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Tomena Jo Thoreson.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Theresa D. Sturgeoh.....	GS-7.....	3,825
Doris M. Mahon.....	GS-6.....	3,575
Marianne B. Duncan.....	GS-5.....	3,350
Gloria P. Marasco.....	GS-5.....	3,350
Anita M. Haskell.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Vivian M. Snipes.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Lucretia L. Quinn.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Clyde F. Roberts, Jr.....	GS-4.....	3,275
Mary McClintock Rice.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Florence E. Ekman.....	GS-3.....	2,650
Mary J. Gallagher.....	GS-3.....	2,650
William H. Cleysteen, Jr.....	GS-3.....	2,650
Mary E. Herron.....	CPC-3.....	2,732
Elzie E. Plater.....	CPC-3.....	2,492
Lloyd T. Maul.....	CPC-3.....	2,492
William A. Scott.....	CPC-3.....	
Total (24).....		98,341

Executive Secretariat, Committee Secretariat Staff

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Earl D. Sohm.....	GS-14.....	\$8,800
Bradley H. Patterson, Jr.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Albert P. Toner.....	GS-13.....	7,600
Joseph M. Gerrety.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Robert G. Efteland.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Robbins P. Gilman.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Charles T. Lloyd.....	GS-11.....	5,400
Albert M. Cornelius.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Wallace R. Lampshire.....	GS-9.....	4,600
Donald Degan.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Ada M. Van Hise.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Frank C. Colcord, Jr.....	GS-7.....	3,825
Gerhard J. Drechsler.....	GS-7.....	3,825
K. Geniel Clay.....	GS-6.....	3,700
Ann M. Lydon.....	GS-5.....	3,350
Celia Barmack.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Yvonne T. Meurs.....	GS-5.....	3,225
Vera M. Anderson.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Deloris A. Naylor.....	GS-5.....	3,100
Katherine L. Russell.....	GS-4.....	3,355
Pauline K. Williamson.....	GS-4.....	3,115
Susan Shields.....	GS-4.....	3,035
Helen D. Hill.....	GS-4.....	2,955
Dulcie Mae Chalfa.....	GS-4.....	2,875
Anna B. Caherty.....	GS-3.....	2,730
Betty A. Melton.....	GS-3.....	2,730
Jerome A. Perkins.....	GS-2.....	2,450
Total (27).....		114,545

Executive Secretariat, Correspondence Review Staff

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Blanche Rule Halla.....	GS-13.....	\$8,200
Helen L. Daniel.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Sarah D. Moore.....	GS-12.....	6,400
Eunice A. Lincoln.....	GS-9.....	5,350
Zolita F. Kent.....	GS-9.....	5,100
M. Elizabeth Denham.....	GS-9.....	5,100
Lillian C. Roberts.....	GS-9.....	5,100
Mary G. Lackey.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Lillian C. Wall.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Edna M. Lindsay.....	GS-7.....	4,450
Esther S. Kauffman.....	GS-7.....	4,325
Christine S. Hood.....	GS-7.....	4,200
Elizabeth M. Anderson.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Margaret Jennings.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Grace T. Kalness.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Pauline F. Spaford.....	GS-7.....	4,075
Cleo'a B. Myers.....	GS-4.....	2,955
Total (17).....		83,030
Grand total, Executive Secretariat (113).....		527,708

Special Assistant for Press Relations

Name	Grade	Annual rate
Michael J. McDermott.....	GS-15.....	\$10,750
Carroll Kilpatrick.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Lincoln White.....	GS-15.....	10,000
Reginald P. Mitchell (FSO).....	GS-12.....	7,600
Joseph W. Reap.....	GS-12.....	7,600
Wilfred J. Duda.....	GS-11.....	6,000
John B. Penfold.....	GS-11.....	5,800
Sarah F. Glancy.....	GS-8.....	4,700
Margaret J. Halden.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Eugenia E. Sheats.....	GS-7.....	4,575
Virginia J. Hudson.....	GS-7.....	4,325
Alice M. Griffith.....	GS-7.....	3,950
Mary R. Holway.....	GS-5.....	3,850
Alice McGavack.....	GS-5.....	3,850
Augusta H. Wagner.....	GS-5.....	3,850
Lula S. Matheny.....	GS-5.....	3,725
Jewel H. Himebaugh.....	GS-5.....	3,600
Elizabeth F. Coakley.....	GS-5.....	3,475
Nell G. Cromer.....	GS-5.....	3,475
Henrietta E. Avery.....	GS-4.....	3,355
Jeanie L. Thigpen.....	GS-3.....	2,810
Margaret D. Thomas.....	GS-2.....	2,610
Charles M. Johnson.....	CPC-3.....	2,732
Eugene S. Miller.....	CPC-3.....	2,332
Total (24).....		118,339

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there are over 800,000,000 people in the countries now controlled by the rulers of Soviet Russia.

This is approximately 34 percent of the population of the entire world. This great mass of humanity is the foundation on which the Kremlin must depend for strength.

Not all of these 800,000,000 people, however, are willing subjects of Moscow. The ten to twenty million men and women in Russian slave labor camps are witness to the fact that not all, even among the Russians, are content. Millions in the satellite countries are equally unhappy. Daily reports from inside the iron curtain—Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and so forth—confirm this.

In the battle for men's minds these oppressed and dissatisfied people are potential allies for the free world.

We need these allies.

Our problem is how to reach them.

The Voice of America is the best answer we have to date come up with.

Just how much the Voice has had to do with sporadic uprisings behind the iron curtain is, of course, hard to gage. No one can honestly and truthfully deny but what it has played its part. The expensive efforts of the Kremlin to jam the broadcasts are an admission of their respect for its influence. They dare not let the people of Russia or the satellites know the truth. Their future depends on keeping these millions in darkness and in ignorance. Our chance is to give these same millions the truth which carries with it encouragement and hope.

To silence the Voice now or to prevent its expansion would be to throw away one of our most valuable and least expensive weapons in the present struggle between the free world and the Soviet world.

It would be to deprive our friends behind the curtain of help and encouragement in the battle they, too, are waging.

Sound judgment and common decency demand that we continue and expand the Voice of America. It is a powerful and effective Voice of truth and hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, my position this afternoon is unusual. I am like many others, a critic to a large extent of the Voice of America. I feel, however, that we would make a very grave mistake to approve the Clevenger amendment.

I was one of those who served with a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that 2 or 3 months ago cut the Voice of America funds from \$97,500,000 to \$9,500,000. At the present time, after having spent considerable time and effort investigating personally the operations of the Voice of America and related agencies, I do not feel that we should make this additional cut as proposed. In no way do I condone many of the operations of the Voice of America. For example, I have in my possession today some of the radio scripts that I think are unwise, particularly if the Voice of America wants bipartisan support. These radio scripts criticize and disparage by implication, some very prominent public figures. I firmly believe the agency could pursue a less partisan position and in addition improve the quality of the program. Nevertheless, even if we do not like all phases of the operations of the Voice it does not justify slashing the funds further than recommended by the committee.

Let us review for a minute what has been done already by this subcommittee from the economy point of view. The Voice of America or the United States Information and Education Program requested \$115,000,000 for the current year's operations. The subcommittee cut \$30,000,000 from the budget request and gave the agency \$85,000,000 for this 12 months. In addition another \$10,000,000 cut was made; so, altogether this year you are going to have a \$40,000,000 cut out of a \$125,000,000 request. If you approve the Clevenger amendment, you are going to have an additional \$15,000,000 cut.

The reason I do not like to see a cut made any deeper than has already been

made is because I fear that such a reduction might do away with some of the highly essential operations of the Voice of America and related agencies. Recently this particular danger was vividly brought to my attention by a letter I received from a very close personal friend, a doctor who happens to be in Pakistan at the present time. I will read excerpts from his letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is recognized.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if that was a unanimous-consent request—

The CHAIRMAN. It was not a unanimous-consent request; the gentleman from Minnesota was recognized and yielded to the gentleman from Michigan, which he had a right to do.

Mr. FORD. This letter is from a friend of mine who happens to be a physician and surgeon in Pakistan. He writes as follows, and I think every Member should listen to this very closely:

I am now a surgeon attached to the United Christian Hospital in Lahore, serving as rather an independent missionary. I think we have the only plastic-surgery clinic in Asia, and we are building a modern American hospital in the country which is at an extremely low ebb medically.

We have stepped into this medical vacuum and are trying to do a good job as Americans in an area which is under heavy fire from Soviet propaganda. There is a growing antipathy toward the Western democracies in this part of the world, as the feeling of nationalism in the countries so long under domination of the West increases. The situation is very cleverly exploited by Soviet Russia, and it seems to me they have handled their campaign with disturbing efficiency.

Much to the dismay of our State Department, the Soviets swamped a medical conference a couple months ago with prominent Russian doctors, and got the key places on the program. I was invited to attend at the last minute through the aid and assistance of Ambassador Avra M. Warren as a representative of the United States, and was given a place on the program through the courtesy of the Pakistan Medical Conference Program Committee. The Soviet scientists gave out with 100 percent propaganda from beginning to end, but they were given an ovation before and after every speech regardless. My own talk, which was purely surgical and illustrated with color movies, was well received, and I was besieged afterward by students who wanted to know all about medicine and medical education in the United States of America. Later in the Soviet Embassy there in Karachi we delegates were treated to another barrage of Soviet propaganda in the form of beautiful color movies purporting to show that all was peaches and cream behind the iron curtain.

Mr. MARSHALL. That substantiates the information I have received from former Congressman Gale, of Minnesota, that the Office of Information is doing a splendid job in that part of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a crying shame that some Members are opposing this amendment because of

certain individuals they do not like and not thinking about the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this letter goes on further to say:

This is an informal letter to a friend, and not any formal report to my Congressman. I am in no position to incur the wrath of the State Department, or dabble in politics, either Pakistan or American. My chief job is to provide expert surgical help to a diseased and underprivileged people, and that job I thoroughly enjoy. However, I am intent on serving my country here in any way I can, and I am prepared to do almost anything to help stop the flood of communism that seems to be engulfing us on this side of the world. It is past the eleventh hour, but if we all work with speed and intelligence, I firmly believe we can still save the East for democracy.

I bring this situation to the attention of the Committee, because my friend wants and needs help in Pakistan in combating the insidious influence of Soviet Russia. There is a chance this reduction in the committee figure will prohibit the proper expansion of our anti-communism programs throughout the world. This cut might harm our efforts when and where we need to go forward the most.

It seems to me that we are most unwise to cut these funds any further. There is already at 32-percent cut in this appropriation item. We know of the many millions of dollars Soviet Russia is spending to jam the Voice of America throughout the world. It would be tragic, in my humble judgment, for us in the House of Representatives at this eleventh hour to jam the Voice of America by slashing Voice of America funds more than the 32 percent already recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. America needs a louder and clearer Voice and we cannot obtain that result by this amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the Russians are spending millions of dollars promoting their interests. Personally, I think American democracy and freedom is worth more than \$15,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Clevenger amendment to reduce the appropriation. The gentleman from Texas referred to the great disbursements made for advertising by the tobacco people, the liquor interests, the Coca-Cola Co., the beer companies, and so forth. Those concerns spend their own money, they do a good job as they see it of appealing to the consumer, and they get dividends on the money spent. I protest against the cheap paltry dividends the American people have received, and those in my district in particular, for the tax dollars they have put into the State Department's Voice of America. If I had my way about it I would cut out the entire program as now carried on by the State Department and keep the appropriations withheld until a genuine American program was designed to go on the air.

Now, then, if you want to put a genuine Voice of America on the air which represents the people of this country,

the ideals and institutions for which we have fought and stood for 164 years, I will support it, but I will not support the cheap, dirty stuff that has gone out and against which members of this committee protest.

That is exactly the way I feel about it, and I have a lot of people in my district who will back me up on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a quote from the Soviet Home Service of Moscow. The men in the Kremlin, it appears, are not in favor of the Voice. They share with some of my good friends here on the floor the belief that the Voice should be curtailed if not completely silenced. Listen to this:

With the object of befuddling the brains of the peoples of Marshallized countries and of converting them into obedient tools of the criminal plans of the warmongers, United States ruling circles are striving, on the one hand, to flood these countries with reactionary man-hating propaganda, literature, films, and periodicals, propagating the present aggressive course of United States policy; and, on the other hand, they are insisting that the governments of Marshallized countries should in their turn develop and intensify the praising of American ideology and the American way of life.

I should also like to quote from the column of that great columnist Drew Pearson, of Tuesday, July 24, 1951:

VOICE AND OATIS LINKED

Reports from behind the iron curtain indicate that one reason for the seizure of AP Correspondent William Oatis by Czechoslovakia was that American propaganda through the Voice of America and radio free Europe is hurting.

When the Commies want to get something out of the U. S. A., their crudest but most successful technique is to seize an American citizen and hold him as a hostage until we come across with the ransom. The reported ransom in this case is to curtail the Voice and RFE, both really hurting the Commie government. Before Foreign Minister Clementis was purged, the Voice made a categorical prediction that he and eight other top Czechs would be arrested. For weeks the Voice pounded home this prediction, giving the exact names of the prospective victims. The Czechs listened but were skeptical. Then suddenly Clementis was arrested and with him four of the eight the Voice had named. All Czechoslovakia seethed at the news. The accuracy of the Voice was commented on everywhere, and its listening audience was doubled.

NOTE.—Despite the State Department's remarkable propaganda job, the budget of the Voice and other propaganda projects had been slashed to ribbons. Congressmen who have been doing the mutilation have been invited to come to the State Department briefing room and get the story (much of it confidential) of what the Department is doing. However, only two or three have bothered to get acquainted.

In heaven's name, Mr. Chairman, are we to play the Moscow game here on the very floor of the United States Congress?

I am for the Voice. If I needed any convincing of the effectiveness of its work, these wild protests coming from the Kremlin would do the job. Let the "galled jade wince." I am in favor of adding another prick to the spur.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] put his finger on the crux of the situation when he said that a great many people object to certain individuals in the State Department and are venting their wrath on this appropriation. For example I disagree thoroughly with the almost daily diatribes and arguments of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] that the cure for all the ills of this country and the world is a return to the gold standard, but I do not advocate the abolition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because his remarks appear in it. I have not heard anyone say what specific person in the Voice of America they would like to get rid of or what particular scripts they want to get rid of. There are probably some scripts that should be changed and some people perhaps should be replaced but you ought to indict the individual rather than the whole program.

There is another thing. There are a lot of things that are going on in the propaganda field that we cannot talk about. Right up here in the gallery sits a representative of the Russian press. If he is not there now he has the privilege by consent of the Members of this House to be there. Therefore I must say I have in this envelope certain confidential documents that the Voice of America has prepared and are putting out behind the iron curtain in conjunction with people who are fighting for freedom behind that iron curtain that I cannot explain on the floor because I do not want the Communists to know about it. But I am permitted and authorized to say that I can show them to any Member of this House who is interested. I think they are effective. Some Members have looked at them. All I ask is that we do not have any leaks like we did with the B-36 program when certain Members of Congress gave the Communists more information than all Stalin's spies. There are a lot of things that the Voice of America is doing that we have not discussed, and as someone has said here, it is hurting the Communist puppet governments. I was in Czechoslovakia about a year and a half ago and I know that some of the propaganda that America is putting out is hurting. It is the truth, and the truth always hurts, and I know that it is hurting those regimes behind the iron curtain because they do not want their people to know how people in America live.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, there is very little opposition to an effective Voice of America in these times of world crisis. I have heretofore spoken on this subject at great length. I think the Members know my position and my feelings, that we will never have an effective Voice of America until it is coordinated and until we eliminate the duplication and competition which the Voice of America as we know it is facing today.

We should have one strong coordinated Voice. All of these competing Voices of America should be brought together in order that our Voice will become stronger and more effective.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The trouble with the Voice of America is that it is not doing a job. That is the reason why many of us are terribly disturbed. Frankly, for my own part, I would not for a moment think of such a thing as cutting this item if the money were being spent effectively. But when we have such situations as Mr. Hulten, who was in charge of it, and who had failed for so long, and who moved out of being in charge, but is still on the payroll, and William T. Stone, whose name was in the paper in connection with the Senate investigation, and that type of folks, it disturbs me. Frankly, the whole picture is that they are putting out a lot of stuff. Reports come in to the State Department from our embassies indicating how little it is being heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] are correct, God help us, because in the struggle in which we are engaged today with the Soviets all over the world we certainly need propaganda warfare, and it is necessary that we prosecute such warfare relentlessly. Bullets alone will never kill an idea or a belief. Only a superior idea or belief can win.

As I walked into the Chamber the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] handed me some propaganda sheets the Russians are spreading throughout the world. Let me show them to you. This poster is an example of what the Russians are spreading throughout the Middle East. The picture on the left has the phrase, "We are transforming deserts into blooming lands." On the right it shows American bombers obviously going over Korea, and it states, "They are transforming cities and villages into deserts." Do you want no answer to these? Will you let these lies prevail because you refused funds? This amendment would give victory to the Soviets by default.

Here is another poster; one that is being spread throughout China and Korea. Translated, it says, "The American world order, the military adventures of the imperialists hold in store for them only catastrophe." This one is going all through the Far East. This one is going through the Middle East. If we are not meeting them through the Voice of America and our educational service, then, as I said before, God help us, for any victory we may win will be empty and short-lived.

The difficulty with the approach of the Members on the left side of the aisle, it seems to me, is that although they profess to support the Voice of America, they want to cripple its effective-

ness, in order to get at one or two gentlemen whom they dislike. Does it make sense to take funds away from an activity which they admit is vital? Of course it does not. You cannot breathe life into something by destroying the element which gives it life. You cannot revitalize an agency by denying its funds. You are making an appropriation now for the entire year. You are making an appropriation now to spread the American way of life and the American concepts of democracy throughout the entire world.

Mr. Chairman, war is brutal and tough; psychological warfare no less than any other type. You cannot waltz through a war. You need firepower—you need firepower for ideological warfare, as well as for active battle, and weapons creating firepower must be paid for. If you cut this appropriation it would have the same effect as though you had taken bullets and guns away from the soldiers who are fighting your battles on the war fronts of the world.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. The gentleman from Michigan in addressing his remarks to my talk was concerned with dividends. Although the gentleman from Michigan did not yield to me at the time, I should like to say to him that in the battle for the minds of men he can measure his dividends in gold star mothers if this program fails.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is certainly correct. I say to the House that this is an important vote. This is vital in maintaining the struggle against the Soviet throughout the world. We must carry it on through an effective means of propaganda in order to supplement and assure total victory in our fight against the forces of oppression.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the thing about this proposition is just this: Unless we serve notice on the Voice of America by adopting this amendment that we want that place cleaned up and made effective, and the people put in charge of it who can do a job in supporting the United States of America, we will indeed be building an army of gold-star mothers. That is where our trouble is. We are not doing the job. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the efforts he has made. But we have to go further. We have to make them clean up and have a good Voice of America. God help us if we do not have the courage to meet this situation and tell those people that they must clean up and have an effective Voice. I was disappointed when the majority leader came here and produced a list of these prominent people who he said were members of the Advisory Committee. I talked with a member of the Advisory Committee a little while ago, who said he had not been called to a meeting in a year. The editor of the Saturday Evening Post, who was on that committee, has never been called to a meeting, and he wrote just a little while

ago just what he thought about the situation and the way it was not being carried on for the good of the American people to get across the message of where America stood. I want to see that done. I want to see somebody who has some knowledge of the psychology of the people to whom he is broadcasting doing the job. I want to see them putting something across. If we do not tell this fellow that he cannot go along in this way any longer, it is just too bad. That is all.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will make a move toward a real Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I say that this committee has already served that notice to which he refers, when it cut this appropriation from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000. Let me point out this to you. In the marking up of this item of this bill, every single member of the subcommittee present, both majority and minority was in agreement with the exception of the gentleman from Ohio who now offers the amendment to cut the appropriation to \$70,000,000.

The gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and others who have spoken in support of the pending amendment have been opposed to having any Voice of America for a long time past.

I say to you definitely that if you adopt this amendment the radio broadcasting and the overseas missions of the Voice of America would have to be curtailed below the minimum program level considered essential by your committee. The six new languages approved by the committee could not be added to the broadcasting schedule. We would be cutting our radio broadcasts to Russia below the minimum requirement of 3 hours daily, or our 1½ hours to the European satellites, or our half-hour programs to such vital countries as India, Malaya, Indonesia, and Thailand. We must not allow our staffs overseas to fall below the present ratio of one American for every million and a half persons of the free world. The Kremlin has one propagandist for every 660 people in the world. If the \$70,000,000 proposal is accepted, it will mean that Russia's expenditure of over a billion dollars a year, not counting the money spent by the satellites and the native Communist parties, will give her a 15 to 1 fire-power advantage over us.

May I point out to you further that if you adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] it would be possible to produce only one motion-picture program about every 6 weeks. I am confident that the Members of this House will look at this in a sane and sober manner and that they are not going to go along with this proposed remedy for the patient's sore throat—a remedy that would cut off the patient's head.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Ohio, but

I must ask that the so-called Clevenger amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. CLEVENGER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD of Idaho: Page 15, line 25, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That funds appropriated herein shall not be available for any broadcast of any information about the United States until the radio script for such broadcast has been submitted to and approved by a committee of members of the Daughters of the American Revolution, appointed by the president general of such organization."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho desire to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will only hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is a limitation and not legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman completed his statement on the point of order?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment definitely provides for certain things to be done and invites attention to a decision rendered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] in which it is stated:

An amendment withholding expenditures of appropriations unless and until certain books were supplied free to the National Library for the Blind is ruled out of order.

The amendment very clearly contains legislation which is sought to be offered to an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some unanimity of opinion the Voice of America shall be

permitted to continue. The whole question seems to be: With what?

The good sense and patriotism of the American people have been outraged, not only by the ineptness of so much of the program material but also because of the fact that at least a portion of it has been very definitely un-American, devoted to the thesis that America is not now an indissoluble constitutional Union of 48 States, but that it is a weak and afraid government, seeking to merge its fortunes into some illusory and fantastic world government.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to hitch our wagon to that kind of a star. In the first place, that kind of motive power is too erratic. It tends to pull this way and that as it is dominated by the dissonant voices of ethnic and religious majorities.

In the second place, our wagon has too much in it. It has the glorious record of 300 years of unparalleled success in working out the majority of our national aims. Our wagon not only carries these achievements; it carries the hopes of the world that it shall continue in just this form. We are a governmental light set upon a hill of accomplishment.

We certainly cannot submerge this kind of an America in the Sargasso sea of conflicting and always inferior mongrel and selfish aims of peoples who have yet to demonstrate they understand one jot or one tittle of what we are supposedly trying to carry to them. Freedom cannot be carried to a people in a paper bag. It is a plant of slow growth, which must first be implanted in the soul by Almighty God.

The Voice should leave the realm of mirages and abstractions and tell the story of America as she is. To that end my amendment leaves the editing of the program material used by the voice to the DAR, which is one of several organizations which may yet be depended upon to blow the trumpet of America without the fuzzy overtones of a hybrid and un-American ideology, deeply resented by the majority of our people. If my amendment be adopted, we need have no further fears as to what kind of a message shall be beamed out to the world. The DAR is nonpartisan and deeply patriotic. Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment may be adopted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Page 15, following line 25, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"There is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made."

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of ascertaining the means by which the national interest may best be protected and served in time of peace by the conduct of international information services and in time of war or threat of war by a civilian psychological warfare agency."

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable dur-

ing the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

"There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$50,000 for the purposes of this proviso."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment on the ground that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. However, since this amendment is offered by the charming gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I reserve the point of order so that we might all hear her remarks which I know will be utterly delightful.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that very much. I would like to bring this amendment to the attention of the House again. I have had it in the form of a resolution before the Rules Committee for a great many months.

I have heard a great deal of approval expressed for this plan, beginning with the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Allen, now Ambassador to Belgrade, I understand, by Mr. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Voice of America; and other public-relations officials, as well as by Members of the House. I spoke to the Speaker in the closing days of the last session of the Congress, and I hope that I have his approval and his interest in it.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, after hearing all the debate on the Voice of America for several years, we are acting as a perfectly futile body and that the State Department is practically futile in its efforts to have an effective Voice of America. A commission of Members of Congress constantly on the watch would be most constructive and would be a great protection to America.

Mr. Chairman, we have too many voices as it is.

There should be one Voice of America for the United States—not several, such as ECA, point 4, Voice of Freedom, and the commercial broadcasts.

There should be a continuing legislative examination of psychological warfare practices and policies, such as was proposed in my resolution introduced in this Eighty-second Congress and in the proposed amendment.

There should be an immediate appraisal of successful and unsuccessful programs—radio, press, pamphlets, motion pictures, and so forth—as employed in all areas. This should be done with a view toward abandoning unsuccessful programs and stepping up successful ones.

Radio Washington should be the name source of United States of America official broadcasts.

There should be a report to the people. United States commercial radio and television corporations would be pleased to cooperate. This report, made weekly, would say what is being said about us by other nations and say what we are replying to those other nations through the Voice of America. I have a letter from Secretary of State Barrett written last year approving that.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, that instead of having the Voice of America we should have a Radio Washington. Every country in the world knows Washington, knows that it is the seat of our Government, and they would pay attention to what goes out over Radio Washington. They pay attention to Radio Rome, to Radio Paris, and BBS, which is really Radio London. Today no country pays any attention, so far as I can tell, to the Voice of America. They feel it is still the old commercial voice that was started years ago and not a government voice.

I earnestly hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will assist in having this commission created. Since the Democrats are in control, there would be more Democrats on the commission than Republicans, and it should be nonpartisan. It would work from month to month and year to year.

We all know of the effective work done by Admiral Zacharias in his radio broadcasts to Japan during World War II. It was conceded by many Japanese that the atom bomb was not needed, and that Admiral Zacharias' broadcast brought the Japanese to their senses.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will assist me in getting this resolution passed later.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the gentlewoman knows that this is not the proper forum for the discussion of her proposed legislation. This is legislation that should be handled by the proper legislative committee of the House. I do not express an opinion one way or the other, but it is my duty to make the point of order against her proposed amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I realize that, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your allowing me to speak at some length on it, and I do think that this is the time to bring it to the attention of the House. If I had felt that we had gotten anywhere with the Voice of America, I would not be so insistent in having this resolution passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Instead of having a commission, how would it be if we had MacArthur speak for America? What does the gentlewoman think about that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Well, he is always speaking for America. Many people feel he is the voice of

America and would like to have him elected President of the United States. The Commission provided for in my amendment is a thing that would go on for years and years. I hope we will have a Radio Washington for all times.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He has not faded away yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, I have not the conceit that some other Members have.

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked the gentlewoman and not the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman knows my answer to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman and I are in agreement; I assume that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up any more time of the House. The Members all know what the resolution provides. I realize the amendment is out of order, but time and time again the House has passed legislation that was out of order in an appropriation bill. This is nothing new.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from New York makes a point of order against it. The Chair understood the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to concede the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The Chair will announce, unless there are other amendments to the provision which has been under consideration, that on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 6, page 57, so the Clerk will now read at that point.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right

to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the majority might have a copy of this so-called secret weapon of the Republican Party. I have asked for it now three or four times of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Just as a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a copy of it. I think he has forgotten.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not have a copy, I insist.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 58, following line 14, add a new section to be numbered 109:

"None of the money appropriated in title I of this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within a period of 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation, unless hereafter appointed or reappointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make the point of order against this proposed amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

I direct the Chair's attention to Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 7, section 1632, which reads as follows:

An amendment forbidding expenditure of an appropriation unless action contrary to existing law is taken is legislation and is not in order as a limitation.

An amendment may not, under guise of limitation, provide affirmative legislation on an appropriation bill.

On June 4, 1910, the sundry civil appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, when Mr. N. E. Kendall, of Iowa, offered an amendment providing a new section as follows:

"No money appropriated herein shall be expended for any work performed under contract unless such contract shall contain a stipulation that no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the same, under the employ of any contractor or subcontractor contracting for the performance of any part of said

work, shall be required or permitted to labor more than 8 hours on said work in any one calendar day."

Mr. James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, made the point of order that the amendment was not a limitation but a change of existing law.

The Chairman ruled:

"The rule is well settled that a limitation on an appropriation is in order. It is also well settled that an amendment in the form of a limitation which changes existing law is not in order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is that—

"No money appropriated herein shall be expended for any work performed under contract unless such contract shall contain a stipulation that no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the same, under the employ of any contractor or subcontractor contracting for the performance of any part of said work, shall be required or permitted to labor more than 8 hours on said work in any one calendar day."

"In the first place, there are various appropriations in this bill for the purpose of carrying out contracts. These contracts under existing law do not and cannot contain the stipulation named in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. And if this amendment should prevail, no portion of the money appropriated under this bill for the carrying out of contracts could be expended for that purpose, because those contracts do not contain the stipulation which the gentleman proposes, unless it be held that this law writes into these contracts the stipulation not contained in the contracts themselves. If it be held that the law writes into the contract a stipulation not now in the contract, that would be clearly not only a change of law but a change, possibly, of the contract.

"Under the existing law, also, the department has the authority in reference to making these contracts to leave out such a stipulation as is now provided; and the test, after all, in reference to limitation is whether, when the provision is made under limitation, the officers entrusted with the expenditure of the appropriation may refuse to expend it, or whether they are required to expend it under changed conditions; whether they must construe the limitation as a change of law, and it is perfectly clear that if this amendment prevails that, at least as to all contracts hereafter, the department of the Government expending this appropriation would take this as a legislative declaration that this stipulation must be in the contract and not a mere limitation of discretion on their part for the expenditure of the money. For both reasons the Chair sustains the point of order."

Mr. Chairman, I also call attention to section 1634 of the same volume of Cannon's Precedents, which holds that—

Professed limitations not to become effective "unless" or "until" affirmative action was taken were held to be out of order in an appropriation bill.

An amendment withholding expenditure of appropriations "unless" and "until" certain books were supplied free to the National Library for the Blind was ruled out of order.

I also direct the Chair's attention to section 1640 of the same volume of Cannon's Precedents, which holds that—

Provision that no appropriation provided in the bill be available for any national park "unless" park concessions were granted to highest bidder therefor was held to be legislation and not in order on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is out of order for the reasons just cited.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do, briefly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that the part of the amendment to which the gentleman from New York takes exception and makes a point of order against is in the last 13 words, beginning with the word "unless"; and since he has cited the authorities, and since the Chair has already ruled on a similar point of order to another amendment, I will concede the point of order, and offer another amendment which I have at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, of course the author of the amendment, I presume, has the right to concede the point of order, insofar as he is concerned, but it strikes me that there is a substantial difference between the present amendment and the one which was cited from the precedents. In that case a new law would be required—an 8-hour law. The present amendment in the part following the word "unless" merely recites what is existing law and in our Constitution, and that is that if someone is appointed or reappointed and confirmed by the other body, he then has the office. Therefore, there is a very valid and vital distinction between the amendment now pending and the amendment in the citations given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Language similar to the present amendment was involved in the Lovett case which went to the Supreme Court and there was no objection to the language all the way up to the Supreme Court.

The provision following the word "unless" merely recites what is existing law under the Constitution, to wit, the appointment by the President of an officer and his confirmation by the Senate. No additional duties are required. There is a great deal of difference between that and the requirement of the amendment cited from the precedents that an 8-hour law be enacted before the amendment could become effective.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then, Mr. Chairman, if I may do so, I will not concede the point of order, so that the Chair may rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from California has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has listened to the argument presented and has followed the precedents cited by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and is of the opinion that the gentleman has correctly stated the precedents appearing in section 1632 of Cannon's Precedents.

The Chair would invite attention to the fact that that decision was made by one of the most accomplished legislators and one of the greatest parliamentarians who ever served in this body, the Honorable James R. Mann, of Illinois.

The gentleman also cites section 1634 of Cannon's Precedents, to which the Chair referred a moment ago in passing upon a point of order made on a previous amendment offered.

In response to the observation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY], the Chair thinks he should state that the Chair does not know any provision of law requiring the President of the United States to submit the name of one of his Cabinet officers to the Senate for confirmation after that Cabinet officer has been appointed and confirmed by the Senate and is now acting and serving.

The Chair invites attention to the last part of the amendment presented: "Unless hereafter appointed or reappointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate." That would clearly impose a duty upon the President of the United States to reappoint a Cabinet officer and submit the name of that appointee to the Senate for confirmation. Therefore, that would clearly provide legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 58, following line 14, add a new section to be numbered section 602:

"None of the money appropriated in this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within a period of 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of, a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for, a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, and I will reserve the point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to establish a principle. It is that a Cabinet officer, like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion.

The United States is going through what may well turn out to be the most serious and critical period in its history. The future of this Nation will depend on the results of decisions and negotiations now being made. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the suspicion of influence or obligation should not fall upon the principal negotiator, or the head of the policymaking department.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to brush from your mind any of the rumors, the conjectures, the misstatements, the clever cartoons, the propaganda, or even the fishing expeditions of the State Department itself. At no time has my suggested amendment ever included more than 2 or 3 of the names on the list of 37 released by the State Department. At no time has it said that anyone doing business with, or selling to, a foreign nation, should be subject to the principle involved. It has referred only to men and women, never more than three or four in number, who held policy-making positions, and who had, within a few years, represented a foreign government for a fee. This is the principle; the avoidance of suspicion of influence, or obligation.

If you wish to ask me if I would like the amendment to be widened, I would be constrained to say "Yes." Being a Republican or a Democrat has nothing to do with it. The issue is, in simple language, being an American. At the moment, the discussion revolves around one man. He is the head of the executive department which presently is making American policy in Europe, in Asia, in Iran, in South America.

It is an amendment which can be applied, should similar circumstances exist, to the head of any executive agency of the Government.

The language is carefully chosen. It is the language used in the act through which the Congress increased the salaries of various top-flight executives. If we can raise a man's pay by the language, we can require him to meet the conditions serving the safety of the Nation.

The present Secretary of State testified on January 13, 1949—hearings, Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that he left the law office of Justice Brandeis to join the law firm of which, according to his own testimony, he was still a member in 1949. Actually, a shortened timetable of his associations would be as follows:

Joined firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, 1921. Left firm May 1933 to become Under Secretary of the Treasury. Returned to the practice of law November 16, 1933, under the firm name, Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson, Shorb. Firm name changed January 1, 1934. Left firm January 31, 1941.

Assistant Secretary of State, beginning February 1, 1941.

Under Secretary of State, from August 16, 1945, to June 30, 1947.

Returned to the same law firm July 1, 1947, until January 18, 1949.

Became Secretary of State January 18, 1949.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having asked you to observe that list of dates, I ask you now to observe with great care the following dates, in which the same law firm, or members of that firm, represented, for pay, foreign nations. This to me is very important.

Let me first quote two statements of the Secretary of State himself. I call him as my witness in support of my amendment. Said the Secretary:

My name was not dropped from the title of the firm. It was dropped from the list of

partners who were connected with the firm. The name and style of the firm remained the same.

Do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, that a foreign nation, seeing the name of the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, then in office, in the firm name of a Washington law firm, that this fact would have any influence in the selection of a law firm to represent that nation in profitable negotiations with the United States Government?

And again:

I had no further connection with (this law firm) until I returned to private practice on July 1, 1947.

Please note: Upon his return to private practice in 1947 the Secretary did have a financial connection with the law firm and this continued until January 18, 1949, 3 days before he became Secretary of State.

The Secretary was asked if there was any chance for public misunderstanding. This is the point, Mr. Chairman, of my amendment. His reply was frank and honest. I quote:

I should think there might very easily be, and it will be my recommendation to my partners that they would please me very much, and I think serve themselves, by dropping my name from the style of the firm.

I now come, Mr. Chairman, to the side of the picture which creates the suspicion of influence—the firm's business with foreign governments. Shall I ask you again, Mr. Chairman, if you are willing to assure me that the fact that the Secretary of State was in and out of a law firm at intervals had no connection with this business, or with its going to that firm?

March 1946, the Government of Iran retained the law firm to represent it in proceedings before the Security Council, which grew out of a complaint filed against Iran by the Soviet Union. The fee was \$25,000. All these figures and facts are from the Senate hearings and from other factual records.

In July 1941 the firm was retained by the Danish Ambassador. The present Secretary of State was then the Assistant Secretary of State.

In December 1945 one of the members of the firm was retained to represent the owners of nine Finnish ships. The present Secretary was then Under Secretary. This case, not being that of representing the Government itself, does not fall under my principle.

On February 8, 1947, the firm was retained by the Greek Government, to advise in proceedings before the United Nations. The present Secretary was then Under Secretary.

In December 1946 the firm was retained by the Royal Swedish Air Board, in connection with the purchases of aircraft made in this country. The present Secretary was then the Under Secretary.

In November 1947 the firm was retained by the Republic of Colombia. The present Secretary was then back in the firm.

The most interesting example of representation was the deal over the loans to Poland. This was in October 1945. The firm was retained by the Polish Supply Mission. The present Secretary was

then Under Secretary. The loan was granted, totaling \$90,000,000. The firm's fee was \$50,175. The Ambassador to Poland, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, opposed the granting of the loan. I refer you to his book, *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, at page 237. Only after President Truman, in March 1947, made a strong statement of disapproval of the activities of the Polish Government was the representation dissolved.

There is one interesting omission in the testimony before the Senate committee from which I am quoting. The Secretary undoubtedly forgot to mention, unless my memory is in error, that this loan was handled for the firm by Mr. Donald Hiss.

Is not this enough, Mr. Chairman? Is there any lawyer here, familiar with the code of ethics of his high calling, who does that think that, innocent as each individual case may be, it would be well for the present Secretary of State to step out and to protect the United States, in its present negotiations, and those impending, from even the faintest breath of suspicion of interest or influence or obligation?

Is there any judge who, under similar circumstances, would not disqualify himself? He might be an honest and capable judge, but the dignity of his profession and the protection of its integrity would be a decisive factor in his unwillingness to invite misunderstanding or suspicion.

There is one other feature of this curious and interesting case, but I shall discuss that separately on another day. I do not have time now. This is the question of dual citizenship, as it is called, under international law. The present Secretary of State is an American citizen. He is, unless he himself has taken affirmative action to change this status, also a subject of Great Britain. I have seen no record of this required renunciation which must be taken after he has attained maturity. Dual citizenship is a curious status. It would enable anyone falling under it to ask for a passport from either the United States or from Great Britain. I have known of people who have gone abroad, sometimes with one passport, sometimes with the other. In this case it does not in any way challenge the Secretary's American citizenship, it only adds to the necessity of having a head of this executive department who can under no circumstances, and for no reason, be suspected of being influenced by another nation in negotiations in which, as I said, the future of the United States may well depend.

It is better to stand on principle than to yield the future of the United States to political expediency.

I leave to others the question of the Secretary's competence in the administration of the office he now holds. I confine myself to the principle of influence and obligation.

The amendment is simple:

On page 58, following line 14, add a new section, to be numbered 6:

"None of the money appropriated in this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within 5 years preceding

his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of a professional firm which derived part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation."

Personally, and aside from this amendment, I think we might well consider the record of the State Department under the present Secretary. Do you agree with a policy which told Russia we would not defend Korea and then, when the Russians took us at our word, sent our men, unprepared, into battle, on Korea?

It is a policy which deprived us, because of personal antagonism, of the brilliant services of General MacArthur. Can you imagine General MacArthur letting even the State Department get him into a position where the cease-fire negotiations could be used for Communist propaganda?

Our State Department, largely due to the present Secretary of State, has lost us the friendship and support of China. Today, China, a member of the U. N. and an ally who fought Red Russia for years before we got into the Japanese conflict, is not being invited to the negotiations over the peace treaty with Japan.

Are you willing to leave Iran, and the possibilities of world war III, to the same influences? Do you want to retain the Russian influences in the Department?

Do you want the imperialistic policies of England to control, or the liberty-determining policies of our own Constitution, and of our own struggle for liberty?

It has been said on this floor, and in the newspapers, that the State Department, under the present Secretary, is the greatest single influence in Washington. It has been said that it controls the White House thinking, and that its influence is strong in the Democratic Party. We know that it influences the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. We are about to see today if it influences the House of Representatives. The Republican Party has twice already passed resolutions saying the people of the United States have lost confidence in the present Secretary of State and that he should resign or be removed.

That is the subject of the amendment, the unfortunate result to the Nation of a loss of confidence. The amendment is very simple. You have heard it read.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman feels this amendment should apply to all Cabinet officials?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I said I thought it could. In this bill it applies to three.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Why should not the amendment apply to Members of Congress who may have represented certain interests, then are elected to Congress, or to Members of Congress who have served here for some time and then go out to represent private interests and come on the floor of the Congress of the United States and lobby?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can answer that very quickly. The gentleman knows I

am very much in favor of the code of ethics which was developed by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. That would be covered by that.

Another answer is that every two years Members of Congress go back to the people and if the people are not satisfied, we do not come back to the next session. We are not the determining factor, without such control, over a policy which may well determine the future history of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It would occur to me that we ought to have a bill dealing with the ethical conduct of all public officials including Members of Congress as well as those appointed by the President of the United States?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am afraid right now the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] would make a point of order against such an amendment if added to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment starts out under the guise of a limitation, "No money in this appropriation shall be paid," and so forth. A limitation, as I understand it, cannot impose any more duties upon an official, any affirmative duties, any additional duties, that do not presently exist by law.

Let us see what additional duties this amendment imposes upon someone. It does not state here, but someone has to carry out the provisions of this amendment if it were held to be in order and it was adopted. "Who in a period of 5 years preceding his appointment?" Who is going to determine the 5-year period? Somebody has got to say. That is an additional duty and responsibility resting upon somebody. That is legislation. "Was a partner in." Somebody has to pass on that. That imposes additional duties upon somebody. "Or a member of a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government." That imposes additional duties upon some one, and that duty is not imposed upon anybody by law now. There is no organic law now relating to it. "Or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation." There are many firms where men may be partners in one thing and in one case, and not partners in another. Somebody has to determine all of these factors.

Mr. Chairman, under the guise of a limitation I respectfully submit that the proposed amendment constitutes pure legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that all the information

necessary was necessarily obtained before the appointment was made. It all appears, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, in the Senate hearings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to speak very briefly to the point of order only to point out the absurdity of the argument made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If his argument is logically followed through it would not be possible for the Congress to make any appropriation, because every appropriation that we make requires that someone take some action to determine that a condition or situation exists before the money appropriated can be had or used. For example, if we make an appropriation for the armed services, someone has to certify the individuals who are entitled to receive it. Someone must take action to create the obligation which justifies the expenditure. What I say with reference to this appropriation is true with reference to every appropriation bill. Every appropriation requires something be done before the money becomes available, an action which is incidental rather than legislative.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, the argument as presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts puts the House in this position if it is carried through to its logical conclusion. If the House, in passing upon the appropriation for the Office of Secretary of State, is of the opinion that we should not in the interest of our country have that Secretary of State, then we have one of two choices: to provide no money whatever or take him. I have made inquiry in regard to the amount of money received by Dean Acheson's law firm in claims against United States for foreign countries. It covered the period from the time that our present Secretary of State brought Donald Hics into that law office, up to but not including this year the total fees for representing foreign countries is over \$450,000, not including advance costs—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. WERDEL. I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I make this point of order. I am of the opinion, and I believe many Members of the House are, that we should not have the present Secretary of State—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is not on the point of order. Unless the gentleman wants to discuss the point of order, the Chair will not hear the gentleman.

Mr. WERDEL. If the Chair will bear with me and let me finish, if the Chair sustains this point of order, he then puts us in this position, that if the House is

of the frame of mind that we do not have a Secretary of State to the interest of our country, the only thing we can do is to shut off the whole amount of this appropriation for the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not at all applicable to the question now pending before the House.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from California has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not a proper limitation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment with some degree of care, and would invite attention to the fact that it provides:

None of the money appropriated in title I of this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within a period of 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation.

It should be clear that almost any limitation must necessarily require some action on the part of somebody. One of the classic illustrations given on many occasions by the distinguished parliamentarian to whom the Chair made reference a few moments ago, Hon. James R. Mann, of Illinois, was that if a provision states that "no part of this appropriation shall be paid to a red-headed man," somebody will have to find that red-headed man and determine whether his hair is red; therefore, it would appear that in any instance where a limitation is sought to be imposed there must be some activity contemplated or some effort exerted by somebody to carry out the provisions of the limitation.

The Chair would invite attention to section 1593 of Cannon's Precedents, and reads the syllabus:

A provision that no part of an appropriation be used for payment of any employee not appointed through the civil service was held to be a limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

That decision was on December 8, 1922.

The Chair is of the opinion that that decision is applicable to the pending question raised by the point of order made by the gentleman from New York. It would appear that the over-all and controlling element of the pending amendment is a limitation on an appropriation bill. It is entirely negative in character, and does not affirmatively impose any additional duties upon anybody.

Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MACK of Washington moves that the committee rise and report to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, most of the time on most is-

ues I agree and vote with the Republicans. I do this partly because of party loyalty but mostly because I regard the Republican position on most matters to be the better one.

However, sometimes I support and vote with the Democrats. Today, I agree with those Democrats who are urging a strong bipartisan foreign policy. I believe in a strong bipartisan foreign policy, and I agree with the Democrats who want that kind of a policy.

Most of all I agree with those Democrats who believe the first plank and cornerstone of any effective bipartisan foreign policy is the obtaining of a new Secretary of State.

I find many of the Democratic leaders in Congress agree with me that the present Secretary of State should be dismissed and a new Secretary of State appointed in his place. These Democrats and I all hold this would promote national unity and thereby increase our national strength.

For example, I read in the Washington Post of August 4, 1950, a news item which said:

Representative PRIEST, according to the AP, said in Nashville, Tenn., Tuesday that he felt Acheson and Johnson should be replaced in the interest of national unity.

"I am using my influence toward that end," he said.

He added, "I feel that above everything else today we need unity of spirit and purpose. In the interest of a completely unified effort in the task ahead of us, I feel that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State should be replaced."

I regard the gentleman from Tennessee, the majority whip, as one of the ablest, most patriotic and likable Members of the House. When he says the interest of national unity will be served by the removal of Mr. Acheson, I agree with him, and I am willing to be of what assistance I can to him when he says he is using his influence to get Mr. Acheson removed.

The article also carried the names of several Democratic Senators whom Newsman Wilson claimed had asked Acheson's firing.

This article of Newsman Wilson probably was carried by many hundreds of American newspapers from coast to coast since the United Press serves many hundreds of dailies with its news service.

Also, I have found signed articles in the Washington Times-Herald on May 7, 1951, by News Reporter Walter Trohan and on May 18, 1951, by Reporter Willard Edwards, both of which asserted that Democratic top leaders of the Congress from both its houses went to the White House to bring up the matter of Acheson's removal. The Edwards article says that when one of these top Democratic leaders brought up the matter of Acheson's dismissal that "the President brushed it aside."

Arthur Sears Henning, writing in the Washington Times-Herald on May 21, 1951, only 60 days ago, said:

Two Democratic leaders swelled the anti-Acheson chorus over the week end. Representative PRIEST, of Tennessee, Democratic whip in the House, said that the resignation of Acheson "would contribute to unity in

the country and in Congress." Representative GORE, also of Tennessee, generally an administration supporter, said that "we cannot have unity and leadership while Dean Acheson remains as Secretary of State."

The question is not whether Secretary Acheson is a patriotic man. It is not whether he is an honest man. It is not whether he is a kindly and courteous man.

The vital question is, "Has Mr. Acheson, as Secretary of State, done a good job in defeating the spread of our enemy, communism?"

We must look to the record to find the answer to that question. Twelve years ago the State Department had only 5,000 employees. Today it has almost 29,000.

Twelve years ago, in 1938, the State Department was spending only \$19,600,000 in a year. For the coming year, Secretary Acheson has asked a budget of more than \$283,000,000, an almost fifteenfold increase over 1938.

Also, since 1939 our Government has given away to foreign nations in gifts and grants more than \$101,000,000,000.

Much of this was done under Mr. Acheson's leadership. With all this vast increase in personnel and in dollars expended he was supposed to stop the spread of communism. Did he do it? The answer is that the Russian Communists had 179,000,000 people under their domination 6 years ago and today have 790,000,000 under their domination.

The record reveals that the State Department under Mr. Acheson has failed utterly and completely in checking the spread of communism.

If a football team loses game after game, season after season, the thing to do is to get a new coach. If a business goes into the red ink further and further, year after year, the thing for the directors to do is get a new manager. When our State Department, even with vastly increased expenditures, constantly loses ground in the fight against Russian communism, it seems to me that common sense dictates we should get a new Secretary of State.

I noted a news article in the Washington Times-Herald in its issue of August 4, 1950, referring to Mr. PRIEST's effort to get Mr. Acheson dismissed as Secretary of State, which said:

The President made this statement at his weekly news conference when told by a reporter that Representative PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, had called for both Secretaries [Johnson and Acheson] to resign in view of developments in Korea. Mr. Truman said sharply that PRIEST, as Democratic Party whip in the House, had no business making a statement of that kind.

Despite the President's condemnation of the majority whip, I still think that my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is right, and in the interest of national unity, I will do what I can to assist Mr. PRIEST in getting Mr. Acheson out of office.

But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is not the only Democrat who thinks Mr. Acheson, in the interest of national unity, should be dismissed as Secretary of State.

The Washington Times-Herald of May 3, 1951, less than 90 days ago, carried an article which, in part, said:

Representative Cox, Democrat, of Georgia, said he would support any drive to force Acheson out. So did Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi.

This Times-Herald article of May 3, 1951, quoted the gentleman from Georgia, Representative Cox, as having said:

This would cut the ground from under him [Acheson], and he will have to quit or President Truman will have to fire him.

In an article written by Lyle C. Wilson, of the United Press, one of America's greatest news-gathering agencies, and which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald May 29, 1951, less than 60 days ago, Newspaperman Wilson said:

Columnist Thomas Stokes has been consistently friendly to the Roosevelt-Truman administration. Stokes now reports that * * * Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas * * * and House Democratic Leader McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and the Democratic House whip are among those who have sought Acheson's ouster.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, Mr. Stokes made an incorrect statement. It is not a quotation, but simply an incorrect statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I accept the gentleman's word.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just an incorrect statement.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to state at this time my endorsement of the action taken by the House when the amendment which would have cut \$20,000 from the funds provided for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was rejected. This is a very important item of this bill, and I hope it can be retained throughout the course of the bill through the Congress without cut in funds. This item is of vital importance to the American tuna industry which is now the most valuable fishery in the United States.

I am advised that the proposed appropriation of \$50,000 barely would support a skeleton staff with little equipment at the United States headquarters in San Diego, Calif., and would eliminate any possibility of establishing the field laboratory at Puntarenas which has been assured Costa Rica. It would be impossible to carry out any of the field work necessary to begin the solution of the bait and other supply problems. If the Congress finds it impossible under present conditions to supply the full amount of funds requested for proper handling of this critical food and international relations problem, then I urge that we

provide at least sufficient funds to meet our minimum obligation with Costa Rica. The appropriation should be sufficient to at least enable the Commission to get under way with a small staff, establish a field station at Puntarenas, and carry out the minimum amount of field work required to begin solution of the bait problem.

I am advised that at least \$100,000 would be required to cover the necessary skeleton staff and minimum equipment for the work and station at San Diego, Calif., and to cover the field station and the gear and boat services to begin the bait work in Costa Rica waters, and I urge that this entire amount be made available.

In 1950, over 400,000,000 pounds of tuna were landed by American fishermen and this was processed into canned tuna and byproducts having a wholesale value of \$125,000,000. The industry gives direct employment to many thousands of fishermen and cannery workers, not to mention the related industries that service this huge fleet. In addition to the large vessels that engage in the fishery all the year around, there are about 2,500 smaller boats that fish for tuna during a part of the year, when they can no longer fish for salmon or other fish. This provides year-round employment for both fishermen and cannery workers. Investment in tuna vessels and shore establishments is in the vicinity of \$125,000,000.

In 1950 the American tuna industry established new records of production for the fifth consecutive year—and consumption kept pace with production. Any threat to the continuing welfare and growth of this industry is a threat to an important high-protein, low-cost food resource. As food prices mount, canned tuna becomes increasingly essential to our national diet.

The cost of conducting the full-scale investigation amounts annually to only about three-tenths of 1 percent of the value of the product. That does not seem a high rate to pay to insure continued production.

Most of the tuna is taken by bait boats. This type of fishing is completely dependent on availability of live bait which is thrown out to attract the tuna. The bait fish are found in the territorial waters of the Latin-American countries of the tropical Pacific. They cannot successfully be transported from United States waters.

The bait situation gives rise to some of our most critical international fishery problems, that can only be settled between governments. The people of the Latin-American countries have seen this huge fleet of United States vessels fishing at their doorsteps, harvesting this valuable resource of the high seas. They are not now able to participate in the tuna fishery themselves, but they hope one day to be able to do so. They are fearful that the United States will exhaust the resource before that day comes. They are fearful, too, that the fishermen will exhaust the bait resource which is a valuable source of revenue to these na-

tions. Tuna fishermen pay annually some two and one-half to three million dollars, in licenses and fees, for the privilege of taking bait from the territorial waters of countries south of the United States.

Such information as we now have indicates that these fears are not well-founded, but not enough scientific evidence is available to prove the case or convince our neighbors. As a result of these apprehensions of our Latin-American neighbors, the tuna fleet frequently operates under restrictive conditions that are not conducive either to efficient production or to good relations. License fees and fishing regulations have been changed often and radically, sometimes with very little notice or none at all. Taking of bait during certain seasons has been prohibited. These measures, promulgated in the name of conservation, are taken without factual information and hence are not in fact protecting the stocks.

This situation has created irritations and tensions resulting in needless friction. If allowed to continue, they constitute a very real threat to the continued success of the industry.

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was established by treaty to carry on scientific studies which will provide the information necessary to determine the effect of the fishery upon the stocks of tuna and tuna bait. This can only be done by an international body in which all the affected nations have an equal voice. Our Latin-American neighbors will have confidence in the results of the investigations of the Commission because they will help guide its policies and will participate in its work. That confidence and the resulting solution of the problems could never be achieved by unilateral action, either on the part of the tuna industry or the United States Government.

The tuna convention was approved by the United States and was duly ratified by the Senate. The Congress passed the implementing legislation without a dissenting vote.

The Government of Costa Rica has entered into this agreement with the United States in good faith and has hailed the establishment of the Commission as an earnest of our desire and intention to work out our problems with our Latin-American neighbors and eliminate causes of friction on a fair and factual basis. Costa Rica has invited the other affected nations to join in this cooperative project, and we have reason to believe they will, provided the Commission shows vigor, intelligence, and cooperativeness in attacking the problems which are causing distrust and friction.

At this critical time in the establishment of the Commission and its work, failure of the United States to provide funds adequate to enable the Commission to undertake at least its minimum commitments surely would be looked upon as an act of bad faith on the part of the United States. Not only would the work which has so far been done be

wasted, but we would take upon ourselves a measure of ill will which would set us back in our relations with our neighbors further than before these negotiations were begun. Such a failure would practically eliminate any possibility of resuming this line of approach for a long time to come.

If the Congress did not desire to see this important work undertaken, it should have refused to ratify the convention and enact the implementing legislation in the beginning, rather than make it ineffective by permitting only a starvation diet now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the motion will be defeated, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this amendment to forbid any appropriations to the State Department until Dean Acheson is removed from his office of Secretary of State only after a great deal of thought.

It is not the prerogative of the House of Representatives to select or to remove a Cabinet officer, particularly the man who, by tradition, is the principal adviser to a President. But there comes a time in the life of a nation when unusual events require unusual actions.

Never in history has come such a public demand from all over the United States for the removal of any one man from office. I do not need to tell you this. Your mail, your telephone calls, and personal visits from your constituents have brought the same clamor to your offices.

Why has this situation come about? What has brought on this unprecedented demand? This demand from the people themselves?

It is loss of confidence in the man who has guided our foreign policy where after five short years we not only stand on the brink of war—we are in war—a war in Korea in which the casualties amount to more casualties than we suffered in a full year in World War II. A war called a "police action," which the President, on the advice of his Secretary of State, had no plans of ending except in a stalemate—an act of appeasement itself—and a refusal to permit our military leaders to use their best military judgment. This, in spite of the fact that 90 percent of the troops involved are our own men; that our casualties amount to over 100 percent of the total men contributed by our so-called allies, except Korea.

Who is this man, Dean Acheson, who holds the fate of our country in his hands?

He is the man, who as Secretary of State, refused to turn his back on Alger

Hiss, the convicted perjurer, who was his confidant and aide.

He is the man who insisted there were no Communists in the State Department and who now belatedly has called for the investigation and suspension of some of his top aides years after he had been informed of their machinations.

He is the man who is willing to risk war and fight Communists on one side of the globe but turns a soft answer to them on the other side of the world while our men are fighting and dying.

He is the man, who without precedent in history, has captured the mind of the President so that today he is the most powerful man in the country.

What is Dean Acheson's background? Who is he?

This man who became our fiftieth Secretary of State was born of British parentage. By accident of birth in Middletown, Conn., he became an American citizen.

But did you know he holds dual citizenship?

The British law states that any child born of British parents is a British citizen, regardless of where he was born, unless he rejects that citizenship in writing. Dean Acheson, to public knowledge, has never rejected it.

Most of his youth he spent in Canada. Then he went to Groton, an exclusive boys' school, whose headmaster not only was educated in England but who patterned that school after the British exclusive schools. He was said to be "a lone wolf and a rebel."

I think he has evidenced these qualities in his office for regardless of what the country believes, he rebels against American thinking and is a lone wolf in his foreign policies.

He attended Yale and then Harvard where he came under the influence of Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, another man who not only did not turn his back on Alger Hiss but who appeared in an unprecedented action as character witness before a court trying a man—that same Alger Hiss—on perjury charges involving treason to his country.

Dean Acheson has been in and out of public office in the United States since 1933 when he was Under Secretary of the Treasury. In the interim he has had a lucrative law practice in Washington. In 1940 he was an active member of the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies. As a result of these activities, which aided in pushing us into the war, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of State in 1941.

He held that position under several Secretaries of State. In 1945, he criticized General MacArthur for attempting to make rather than carry out United States occupation policy in Japan and 2 months later, in November 1945, he spoke before a meeting sponsored by the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship. It was in December of that year that Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley who had just resigned as Ambassador to China linked Dean Acheson with a group in the State Department which wanted to arm the Chinese Communists and

bring about the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek and of attempting to defeat United States policy in Iran. General Hurley at that time demanded a full investigation of the State Department.

Throughout his career as Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson has always associated with persons and policies of the so-called left-wing group in the State Department. But in spite of that, upon the resignation of General Marshall, Dean Acheson was appointed Secretary of State by the President in 1949.

Since he has occupied the exalted office of Secretary of State, this American citizen of British parentage has constantly followed the foreign policy of Great Britain with whom he feels more at home by inclination, ancestry and education. He has permitted this country to drift into a defeatist attitude of "waiting to let the dust settle" in the Far East, in order that Britain might carry on trade as usual. He has no plan except to put this country into a strait-jacket of managed economy similar to the Government of Great Britain until some international events move him to some other vague plan.

This man, who has never held elective office in his life, has the power of life or death over our Nation.

It is not enough, that under his Sven-gali-like influence over a weak and vacillating President, that this great country—this strong Nation—has reached the impasse where we publicly announce that we will not fight an enemy and beg for peace at any price but now he proposes that he be absolute dictator over all American citizens.

State Department plans call for Acheson's absolute control over \$10,000,000,000 in foreign-aid programs which include ECA, point 4 and all military allocations of food, clothing, machinery, arms and ammunition. This would give Dean Acheson control over domestic prices and production in the placement of orders and demands for supplies and production materials.

He is already the undisputed boss of this Nation's foreign policy. He controls the public utterances of the Defense Department and a vast propaganda machine in the Voice of America. And only recently we find him using that same Voice of America in his famous guidance paper No. 28, dated December 23, 1949, which was circulated to all our diplomatic missions abroad which gave the false impression that the loss of Formosa would not damage the interests of the United States and that we had no interest in it which was contrary to all military advice. This was a deliberate lie and a party line attempt to excuse the fall of Formosa to the Red Communists when the time was ripe.

Through his allocations of raw materials, both domestic and foreign, he has served his mother country and the British Socialist Government.

All he needs now to complete his absolute control over the Nation is congressional approval.

I say the time is past due for this man to go. A supine President, a weak and stubborn President, has reiterated time

after time that he will not call for the resignation of Dean Acheson in spite of the loss of public confidence and public clamor for his removal. His policies have been proved a failure, and yet he is asking for more power.

There is only one solution—one way to get this albatross from the necks of the American people—and that is by this amendment which would deny funds to the State Department until this "lone wolf and rebel" is removed from public life.

I urge its enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could agree on a limitation of time for debate to 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Make it 20 minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You might as well withdraw that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Phillips amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York withhold that until the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] returns to the Chamber?

Mr. ROONEY. That will be all right with me, but I do not know about the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He would object to you, anyway.

Mr. ROONEY. I know that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire recognition now?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to the Phillips amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does that take precedence over the preferential motion that has been on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman has the floor. He cannot be taken off.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, our esteemed friends on the minority side of the aisle tried the blunderbuss approach, found it boomeranged so badly that they tried to run for cover. They tried the sharpshooter approach and found that such a blatantly illegal proposition had not the chance of a snowball in Hades. Now they want to dupe us with an amendment that is calculated to appear in the best interests of the Government. I refer, of course, to the so-called Phillips amendment, this ruse, the sole pur-

pose of which, as everybody knows, is to "get Acheson"—not by constitutional means but by a camouflaged bill of attainder act. Must we countenance this appeal that the means justify the ends? How low must we be called upon to stoop?

Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I ask that those words be taken down, and I want to state the grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman demand that the words be taken down?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do; and I want to state my reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot state reasons when he makes the demand.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order that the words are out of order because they accuse Members on this side of slippery conduct.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will kindly respect the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do. But under the rules of the House I have the right to state the reason why I complain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman demands that the words be taken down?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For the third time I say "Yes."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY: Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year 1952, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY: Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has listened to these words as spoken and as read twice. The Chair does not think that it should offend anybody for the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to brag of his constituents, as to their character or as to their ability.

It appears to the Chair that these words were spoken with reference to an amendment and not with respect to a Member of the House of Representatives; and therefore, there is no reflection on any Member of the House. The Chair so holds.

The Committee will resume its sitting. The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. ROONEY. So that the gentleman from Michigan thoroughly understands what I am saying, I repeat: Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand that those words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, those are not the words we object to. I want those words taken down that attacked the integrity of the Republican Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the further words, and we will see if these are the words objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the Chair's effort to find the exact words objected to.

The Clerk read certain words.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let the rest of it come along. Let us have the words about the lynching, and about the Member from California.

Mr. CHELF. Read his whole speech.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that would be a good thing.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts came too late.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is a little late, himself.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. His request was that certain words said back yonder should be taken down. The request must be made at the time the words are being spoken, and those have already been taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts demanded that the words be taken down apparently as soon as they were uttered. The Chair is endeavoring to find the words objected to. He will have the Clerk report them as soon as they are transcribed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. When a demand is made that the words be taken down, and I am not stating this in any way in opposition to the efforts to have the words taken down, the words taken down should be those that preceded the de-

mand, not those that may have been expressed 1 or 2 minutes before.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman that we had to let the gentleman develop his theme before we raised the point of order. Now I want the right words. The reference to lynching is what I want read particularly.

The CHAIRMAN. An effort is being made to find the right words.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORAND. In order to straighten out this entire situation, would it be possible for us to have the entire speech read? Then our friends on the other side would surely have the words they want.

The CHAIRMAN. An effort is being made now to have the words transcribed.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read certain words.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, what about the words to the effect that the gentleman from California was dishonorable?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, without in any way touching on the question or expressing my own views as to whether the remarks in reference to lynching violate the rules of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to withdraw the remarks objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would normally be very glad to have the gentleman withdraw his remarks, but in view of the way the gentleman has presented his remarks, making attacks upon the Republican membership and the gentleman from California in particular, these remarks are unparliamentary and should not have been uttered. I cannot let the gentleman withdraw them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not conceding that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is why I cannot let him withdraw them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, whenever this sort of thing has happened on either side, and Members have asked unanimous consent to withdraw their remarks, permission has been given.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But such a request is not preceded by the kind of statement you just made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will withdraw my statement, if the gentleman is disturbed by the statement I made. That was my own personal expression. I will withdraw that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to withdraw his statement in reference to lynching.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Remember, this is a precedent for the future.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair make a ruling on my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair in every instance of this kind has been most liberal with the Member who uttered the words objected to, because he has always thought that great liberality must be indulged in so that we may have free and full debate. On very few occasions has the present occupant of the chair held that remarks were a violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair can hardly agree, however, that the words, applied to the meeting of the Republicans in caucus yesterday were quite proper, and, further than that, he doubts very seriously if referring to legislative actions of those who are movers of legislative action should be using the methods mentioned.

The Chair thinks the words are a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to expunge from the RECORD the remarks made and that he may be permitted to continue in order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] restate his unanimous consent request?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] be permitted to expunge from the RECORD the remarks that he made which were found to be out of order, and that he be permitted to continue in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think if such a request is to be made, it should be made by the gentleman who transgressed the rules of this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is making a request, the whole of which cannot be made at the moment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from New York will, following the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. All in the world the Chair is doing, and what he thinks every other man who is half worthy of occupying the position he occupies would do, is to bring about orderly procedure in the House of Representatives.

The Chair thinks in the interest of orderly procedure that the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts should be agreed to.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will proceed in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to expunge from the RECORD the words objected to by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed sorry that I transgressed a rule of this House. I assure you that I did not intentionally do so. I am a bit disappointed that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] felt that I would attack the integrity of any Member of this House. I have never done so, and in my remarks today I certainly never intended so. I believe those in this House with whom I am intimately acquainted know that I uphold the integrity and the dignity of the Members of this House regardless of which side of the aisle they sit on.

I want to say also that I did not intend to attack the integrity of the Republican Party any more than I would attack the integrity of the Democratic Party. I believe in the two-party system; we must have a Republican Party and a Democratic Party, and I say—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, just a few moments ago the gentleman submitted a unanimous-consent request to close debate. He is now asking five additional minutes for himself. What does the gentleman intend to do with the rest of us? And when do you intend to finish the bill?

Mr. ROONEY. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am merely trying to conclude my remarks. It is my responsibility as the floor manager of the pending bill to oppose this so-called Phillips amendment, and I would like time to advance many constitutional reasons why it should not be adopted. After I have concluded I expect to ask that debate be limited to some extent, but not to completely shut off anybody from speaking on the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman going to object when I ask to proceed for an extra 5 minutes?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I myself will object to a continuance.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 4 minutes, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I object to that. If we are going to object to one, we are going to object to all for the rest of the day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's preferential motion on the ground that there has been no change in the bill since the previous motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]. The parliamentary situation remains unchanged, and for that reason I must make this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I have learned to respect the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] deeply. I respect him for his experience, and his fair-minded approach to every question before this House. I am very much in sympathy with the objective he seeks to attain in his amendment, namely, to bring about the replacement of the present Secretary of State. However, I rise to suggest that what he seeks to do can be done by a better method.

Let me make it clear that I agree with many eminent members of both political parties that Secretary of State Dean Acheson has become a liability. I do not mean merely a political liability. I mean a liability to the American public. He is identified with policies that have dismally failed. In public thinking, he is associated with the biggest, the most glaring, the most tragic mistake ever made by leaders of the American Government, the mistake that has led us into more trouble than any other misjudgment of history, namely, the theory that if we just gave the red-handed leaders of the Russian Kremlin whatever they wanted they would be good and help us create a peaceful world. To the common garden variety of American citizen, who instinctively mistrusted a regime that sent men, women, and children into slavery and death, this was a risk not worth taking at all. Our Government took that risk, and now the American people are paying the penalty of a policy that failed.

In public thinking, Secretary Acheson typifies the policy of continued appeasement and collaboration with Communist regimes, at a time when those regimes threaten the peace and security of free peoples everywhere. He is linked with the loss of most of the gains for freedom made during World War II. Mr. Acheson is now, and forever will be, identified with the statement that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss—at a time

when every person in the State Department under any taint of suspicion of disloyalty should have been kicked out and replaced by those of unquestioned loyalty.

I respectfully suggest, however, that this amendment is unwise, and should not be agreed to, for these reasons:

First, it would set a bad precedent. I might even say it sets a dangerous precedent, to cut off the salary or pay of any public servant as a means of getting rid of him. We have the power to do so, but if Congress does this, what is to prevent the heads of the executive departments using this method of disciplining or firing the employees under them? It certainly could never be defended as good personnel management.

Second, a man is worthy of his hire. If Mr. Acheson is worth keeping on the State Department payroll, then he is worth his salary. If he is not worth his salary, then he ought to be forced to resign.

Third, this amendment would do by indirection what should be done directly by the President of the United States. I realize the loyalty shown by the President to his appointees, even when they no longer enjoy the support of many of our fellow citizens. But I believe that the President can be prevailed upon to take appropriate action in this matter. To that end, I feel that we of Congress should take direct action. Let us make our wishes known by way of a resolution. I have today offered such a resolution, as follows:

Whereas the present Secretary of State has become identified in public thinking with foreign policies that have failed to protect the gains made for freedom and security against totalitarian ideologies in World War II, is associated in public thinking with decisions that have permitted the extension of Soviet Communist power over many areas and many peoples of the world, and no longer represents the firm leadership in the conduct of foreign affairs needed to defend the honor, interests, and security of the United States, therefore it is the sentiment of the Congress that the present Secretary of State has lost the confidence of the American people, and that the President should request his resignation.

Such a resolution meets this question directly and squarely. Such a resolution would permit open hearings before the appropriate committees of this Congress. And quite certainly—if Members reflected the sentiment of the great majority of the people of our States and districts, such a resolution would pass.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I cannot see anything wrong with the gentleman's method of proceeding here. I simply want to say that I agree with him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Withholding the salary of Secretary Acheson would not in any way put him out of office as Secretary of State, would it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the gentleman is correct. It is not legal to serve in public office without receiving compensation. But if Mr. Acheson continued to serve, despite the lack of appropriation for his salary, he could go into court to force payment.

Mr. HARRIS. I mean by that, if the Secretary of State did not draw a salary, that would not prevent him from continuing to act as Secretary of State?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe the gentleman is correct. I am sure the gentleman understands that I want Mr. Acheson removed, but by direct action of the President.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Can the gentleman tell me how we could ever have the resolution considered or vote on it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on some limitation of debate on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4:45. That will give pretty nearly everybody on the floor who desires to do so a chance to speak.

Mr. MEADER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the offering of this amendment was a smart thing to have done. It will fail of adoption and, therefore, have the opposite effect to that intended. But it is here, and speaking for myself I will not run away from it. I have been saying from time to time, in season and out of season, that Mr. Acheson ought to be separated from the State Department, and I cannot now belie these words by voting a contrary opinion.

For those of us who have been clamoring for Mr. Acheson's retirement to vote against the amendment would cast a hurtful reflection upon us.

Mr. Chairman, I have no bias against Mr. Acheson as an individual. He is undoubtedly a man of great charm and ability. But in my opinion, he has as a result of the policies that he has pursued inflicted more damage upon the country than any other man now living. That he has been and is pronouncedly pro-English, everyone recognizes. That he has been, that he is, and that he will continue to be pro-Russian in the sense of maintaining his policy of appeasement, I sincerely believe—the leopard cannot change his spots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, if it would have been possible to persuade me to support the Phillips amendment, the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] would have accomplished that result. I will not be influenced by the inflammatory remarks he made, however, because my judgment on this issue goes far deeper than inflammatory remarks.

I do not wish to be construed as favoring the policies of Dean Acheson, or the State Department, either now or before Dean Acheson was appointed Secretary of State. Some of my colleagues have said that my vote against the Phillips amendment will be so construed. It should not be. I have repeatedly, and with all the force at my command, condemned the costly calamities of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. I have repeatedly urged that our State Department be strengthened and improved, in order that the United States may effectively discharge its responsibilities of leadership in the contest between freedom and totalitarianism.

I refuse to believe that my constituents will misconstrue my position, which I desire to make so plain as to defy distortion.

I regret that the Republican Policy Committee has endorsed the Phillips amendment directed at depriving Dean Acheson of the salary of Secretary of State. I regret it because I think such endorsement is detrimental to the prestige of the party and because it compels me to differ with the position of my party.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to differ with party policy because I believe firmly in the political party system, in party responsibility and party regularity. In union there is strength. Recognizing that legislation involves compromise, I have consistently sought in the past and I will seek in the future to harmonize my views with the leadership and the majority of my party, yielding except on matters of principle on which I feel so strongly that I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us is one of basic principle, on which I cannot yield.

I oppose the Phillips amendment for the following reasons:

First. Its constitutionality is doubtful.

Second. It contravenes our American doctrine of separation of powers, one of the checks and balances by which, in unique fashion, the American people have thus far preserved their liberties.

Third. It is presented as correcting an evil—namely, the impotence, ineffectiveness and ineptness of our Department of State—but it cannot correct that evil. It is thus dangerous as an illusory and deceptive remedy.

Fourth. The real remedy for the weakness, the vacillation and the disastrous failures in the conduct of our foreign affairs is a penetrating, non-partisan examination of our Department of State through congressional investigation with the objective of rebuilding

and strengthening the instrument through which we express and carry out our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I know the American people, perhaps all people, have a tendency to personalize their likes and dislikes of institutions. They do this through centering their attention on the head of the institution which is the object of their affection or their fury. I am not sure the Members of this House are wholly free from this tendency.

However, this in my judgment is not the sound approach to a useful analysis of public problems. I believe we, as legislators responsible for the course of this Nation, should do better than that. That is why we have established the republican, or representative form of legislature. Otherwise we could adopt national legislative policies by a public poll.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time for discussion of this basic issue is so limited, since I would like to discuss my reasons for my vote at greater length. However, I have previously made known publicly my position on the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. In that public statement I developed more fully the reasons I have previously given in this debate for opposing the Phillips amendment. I quote from my statement of May 25, 1951:

Last week, 43 first-term Republicans of the Eighty-second Congress joined in a petition urging the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. Although some newspaper accounts recited that I had joined in this petition, the fact is that I did not.

I am in sympathy with what I understand to be the ultimate objective of this petition; namely, to improve and strengthen the Department of State and to bring an end to vacillation and mismanagement in the conduct of our foreign affairs. But I disagreed with the method suggested for accomplishing this objective.

Congress is powerless to remove an official in the executive branch of the Government, and it seems to me to be an idle act to make a solemn pronouncement of a program which those who urge such a course of action are without any power to accomplish.

I am now studying the preparation of a resolution providing for the investigation of the State Department and the foreign and military policy of the United States by the Congress, with a view to its introduction in the House of Representatives. I would like to discuss with you informally the advantage of such a resolution.

In my judgment, a thorough-going, penetrating exploration of the organizational structure, the personnel, the operating methods, the policies, the decisions and the performance of the Department of State through a competent, dispassionate and non-partisan congressional investigation would be far more fruitful in improving the conduct of our foreign affairs than simply to remove Secretary of State Dean Acheson and supplant him with a new man. In the past decade, there have been five Secretaries of State—Cordell Hull, Edward R. Stettinius, James F. Byrnes, Gen. George C. Marshall, and Dean Acheson. Each new Secretary, upon assuming office, indicated an intention of modernizing and improving the State Department. Yet, I submit that the State Department is just about the same as it always has been.

The responsibilities of the Secretary of State, the size of the State Department, and the difficulty and complexity of the varied problems with which the State Department deals are such that any Secretary of State

must, of necessity, be guided by the factual information, the opinions and the recommendations of subordinate officials in the lower echelons of the State Department. No man, however brilliant or hardworking he may be, can have the time to familiarize himself personally with the many matters for which he must assume responsibility before the public.

This being so, simply changing Secretaries of State but leaving the Department beneath him unchanged gives only an illusory promise of improvement. The philosophy and the policies which emanate from the Department through the Secretary are, and of necessity must be, the composite product of the organization far more than the work of the Secretary himself. Therefore, it seems to me that it is the organization which should be examined, and this examination should be comprehensive as well as inclusive. The administrative methods of the Department of State, which are notoriously involved and cumbersome, should be carefully explored, and a determination should be made whether there is any reason for their continuance, or whether it is simply a case of hidebound traditionalism and encrusted red-tape bureaucracy.

Many of you may recall the instance cited by a House committee 3 years ago, where a company in this country desired to send a check to its agent in Budapest, Hungary, to procure his return passage home. A House committee investigator discovered that the airline company's check and its letter had passed through 37 separate steps in processing in the State Department, being initialed and coded at various stages and had become bogged down in a plethora of red tape and unnecessary procedures.

No organization should be expected to produce satisfactory results if its operating methods are obsolete and unworkable.

The question of centralization of authority should be explored. Are agents in the field or in the various branches of the State Department clothed with adequate authority to make decisions and to take action for which they ought to be competent, or are there unnecessary and time-consuming initialing processes, coordinating committees, and other checks and obstacles which tend to bog down the progress of the work of the Department?

What of the personnel of the State Department? No matter how perfect an organizational structure may have been established, far more important is the character and ability of the men who must make the decisions. Has the State Department been staffed with individuals inclined toward theorizing and abstract thinking in well-sounding but meaningless generalities, instead of hard working, hard thinking, hard bargaining, practical persons of intense and unquestioned devotion to the purposes of our democracy?

What have been the results of the handling of the specific business of our Government in the field of foreign relations? Have our interests been protected? Have our objectives been advanced? Or have we consistently come out second best at the bargaining table? For example, it might be fruitful for a congressional investigation to review such international conferences involving far-reaching decisions such as at Yalta, Tehran, Cairo, and Potsdam. An investigation might disclose the individuals, their capabilities, and perhaps their loyalty to our country and its interests, who represented the United States at such conferences. An assessment of the success of the results of those conferences and an ascertainment of the reasons for those results might well provide lessons and guides for the more successful handling of similar international negotiations in the future.

There has been no significant congressional exploration of the State Department in recent years. The Senate War Investi-

gating Committee, of which I had the honor to be a counsel over a period of 4 years, in many of its explorations of the national defense program in World War II, had occasion to observe the operation of the State Department and the quality of its decisions.

My recommendation that a thorough-going investigation of the State Department be conducted by Congress at this time is, in part, based upon experience derived from the work of the War Investigating Committee. Hearings on lend-lease aid, both civilian and military, investigation of the disposal of billions of dollars worth of United States Government surplus property located in foreign lands after World War II, the investigation of the Inter-American Highway, the preliminary investigation of military government in Germany and Austria, plans made, or the absence of plans, for the acquisition of military bases and rights regarded as necessary to our national defense, and many other similar subjects were touched upon by the Senate War Investigating Committee.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in this debate, nor in developments in recent months, has caused me to change the position I took last May.

The Congress, not possessing the appointive power, which is a function of the Executive, is without authority to remove Dean Acheson or any other individual in the executive branch of the Government. It would be an abuse of the appropriating power of the Congress, even if it were constitutional, to do indirectly what may not be done directly.

Neither is it any justification to say that the Executive has invaded legislative jurisdiction and therefore retaliation is in order. The Congress should recapture its legislative power but should not undertake to assume responsibility for the execution of laws.

The Congress does have power to do something about the unfortunate weakness of our Department of State—it can first investigate, then legislate. That course is one of soundness, power, and wisdom. Seeking to appropriate an individual out of office is the course of weakness, awkwardness, and ineffectiveness.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is not with the thought that I can add any substantial facts with respect to the Phillips amendment that I take the floor on this occasion. It is rather to lay added stress upon several aspects of the present debate which may serve to indicate that the opposition of many of us to the pending amendment springs neither from an admiration for the Secretary of State nor approval of the work that he has done in his vital post. To the contrary, there are few Members on this side of the aisle who would not cast an affirmative vote on a question of impeachment or an amendment providing that none of the funds appropriated in this measure could be expended for any purpose until the Secretary of State has been removed by the President.

Any attempt to interpret as a vote of confidence in the Secretary of State the votes of those of us who do not support

the pending amendment, is a misrepresentation of our position, and should have no place in the official record.

For my part, I feel that my record of opposition is clear and unmistakable. On three occasions I have publicly demanded that the Secretary of State resign, and I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will bear out my assertion that I have lent my support to few measures proposed by the Secretary and acted upon by the committee.

I am opposed to the present administration because I feel that it seeks a change in the constitutional system of government under which this has become the greatest nation on earth. In opposing the administration, I oppose its policies, and I cannot, in my own mind, separate any individual policy or policies as being more objectionable than the sum of the parts.

In the action here proposed it seems to me that we are in effect telling the people of this country that Valhalla is just around the corner if we can only rid the administration of the Secretary of State. This is neither true nor is it an inference which should be left with the people of this country.

Whether Dean Acheson remains as Secretary of State or retires to the private practice of law, the repugnant policies will continue to be made and implemented within the councils of the administration.

This amendment seeks to sweep the Augean stables with a whisk broom, when nothing but an infuriated protest of the American people will do the job which must be done. It seeks to cut off a tentacle of opposition while allowing the intelligence behind present and past policies unhindered freedom of action.

Dean Acheson has been a partner in a disastrous course of action, domestic and foreign. He has long since lost the confidence of the American people, and that lack of confidence has been expressed to me in private conversations by many of those who sit on the majority side of this House. He should go to trial—not a trial by attainder under provisions of legislation, which says, in effect, that no man with a mustache can serve in public office—but to a trial at the ballot box before the tribunal of American public opinion in November 1952. This is the American way, and the way of the Constitution. It is not that we who oppose this amendment hold a brief for the Secretary of State, but only that we deplore the back-door approach based on a matter of personalities instead of upon basic and fundamental issues.

Let the President of the United States answer for his conduct of public affairs to those who authorized him to appoint some of the political hacks he has placed in vital posts. I have no doubt as to the verdict that will be delivered. But I cannot agree that the Constitution gives us the authority to take any action, short of impeachment, in the instance of any individual who carries out the President's policies, mistaken and tragic as some of them may be.

If we have courage—if we have the strength of our convictions, based on

sound fact and absence of hysteria—let there be drawn a bill of particulars against the Secretary of State and let his impeachment be demanded from the well of this House. Many of us who oppose the "mustache approach" to attainer and the principle, if not the fact, of ex post facto legislation will lend our best efforts to the removal of any official against whom charges can be laid and sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I attended the Republican conference the other day, and in the absence of anyone else expressing this thought, I would like to say that there was not a single individual who arose in that conference to say a kind word for Mr. Acheson. I question seriously if there are more than a handful of Republicans, you could not even count them on the fingers of one hand, who would retain Mr. Acheson in office.

Some people disagree as to this method of expressing our disapproval of his administration. Frankly, I do not like it myself, but I have no other way of expressing it.

If any American had told us in the late months of 1945 after VE-day and VJ-day that less than 5 years after the war was over we would be in the precarious position we occupy today, we should have consigned him promptly to the booby hatch. Our position is utterly incredible. We are in precisely the same dazed frame of mind that afflicts half the people of Europe today. They are confused, bewildered, and bewitched by the march of events. Like the people of Czechoslovakia, who never realized for a moment what they were getting into, when they gave the Communists in their midst an opportunity to wedge their way into the Government, we are suffering from a neurotic fear based upon our reluctance and our unwillingness to recognize the facts.

No other amendment will be offered. No other method will be offered by which I can express my views regarding Mr. Acheson. If any of my Republican brethren feel that they will be happy in opposing this amendment, and failing to do the thing that they know in their hearts should be done, that is for them to determine. As for me, this is the only way I can express my contempt for bungling of Mr. Acheson. So I am going to vote for this amendment because I will have no other opportunity. If ever there came a time when the Nation was ready to shout "quits," it is now. The Nation is completely disillusioned with the Washington Government crowd. It is fed up with Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and company on the foreign-policy circuit. There is widespread feeling of no confidence in the administration, and it is being reflected all the way through the Nation. We will have to wait until 1952 to turn Harry Truman out. Harry Truman says that he will not turn his back on Acheson—Acheson says he will not turn his back on Alger Hiss. I repeat, we cannot get to Truman until

1952. This is the only opportunity I will have to get at Mr. Acheson now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] that there is another way in which he can express himself in this situation, and that is the right way to do it. That is, to offer a resolution asking for the impeachment of the Secretary of State. That is the constitutional way to do it, if he really wants to get rid of the Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we might spin all kinds of fancy theories about how this ought to be done, but there is only one issue. Are you for Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State, or not? Let us not kid ourselves about whether this is the wrong way or the right way. I am surprised at some of my Republican friends who say that by all means this must not be done in this manner. Your mail has been no different than mine, and I dare say on either side of the aisle, as far as Mr. Acheson is concerned. You know that your people are not for Mr. Acheson continuing as Secretary of State, and you know that public-opinion polls show that he should be removed by a vote of 7 to 1 or more. Now, what are we going to do? This is the time to make up your minds, because the people of this country will construe our action here this afternoon as a vote of confidence or not. The present Secretary of State has done irreparable damage to our country. I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] in saying that we are reaping in Asia today what the Secretary of State sowed for us. He has let the dust settle and he is settling us. I shall vote for the amendment for the reason that I have lost all confidence in Mr. Acheson, and this is not a personal matter with me. This is the only chance that I shall have an opportunity to vote "no confidence."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we now have the only opportunity that may be offered to voice our opposition to the man who by his words and deeds has rendered the greatest disservice to our country in my memory. Of course it would be better if we could go through the entire Department of State and root out every employee who cannot unequivocally say that he is diametrically opposed to all the philosophies of the Soviet.

I do not believe that any man should be allowed to stand on his constitutional rights when interrogated and hold a place of high trust in the Department of State or any other position of trust in our Federal Government. I am very much in favor of this amendment, because it affords us the only opportunity to show to the people of our country that the

Congress of the United States is opposed to the present Secretary and that he should be removed and to direct the President of the United States to see that a man is appointed Secretary of State who fits into the scheme of life of our great country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] is recognized.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think this amendment has peculiar applicability to the situation existing in the Office of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Acheson's law firm represented the Soviet government of Poland at a time when the Polish police state was being set up, and it was seeking a loan from the United States. At that time, of course, Mr. Acheson was Acting Secretary of State temporarily away from his firm, but as Acting Secretary of State he approved the loan that helped to set up the Red police in Poland. This approval of Acheson's was despite the earnest pleas of our Ambassador in Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, to turn down this loan. On May 16, 1933, when Mr. Acheson was first being sponsored as a Government employee, Senator Tydings said:

It has not been said but should be said that Mr. Acheson has represented the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In other words, he has also in times past represented the Soviets.

Last year Mr. Acheson said he would do nothing to subvert or undermine the Soviet Government or its system. Why will he not do that? Because he has represented these governments as clients. It could very well be that our foreign policy should be such that we should take measures to help the enslaved peoples of those countries to undermine those governments, but it will never be done under Mr. Acheson's policy, because they have been his clients. He recognizes them as legitimate governments, and they are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in 1943 a bill was considered in this House, an appropriation bill, an amendment was offered which sought to fire three men by denying their salaries, and force their removal from the salary rolls of the Department of State. At that time I argued against it as being a bill of attainder. However, the amendment did pass, and it passed in the other body and was eventually tested in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said it was unconstitutional and directed the Congress to pay the back salaries of these three men.

While this may not be a bill of attainder, I think it is in essence the same as a bill of attainder; and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] said, it applies to only three or four people in our Government; so in spirit it is a bill of attainder and, of course, I would oppose it.

But I would oppose it also from another standpoint. I am one of those

who believes that Dean Acheson has done a good job. I am not saying he has done a perfect job, but I want to stand up here and be counted at this time on his side. He was one of the architects of the United Nations, and the people of this country adopted that as a national policy. He spoke in the South for the Marshall plan before General Marshall spoke in Virginia for the plan which was eventually named the Marshall plan. Dean Acheson is the architect of the Marshall plan; it has done more in my opinion to stop communism throughout the world than any other one thing. So I am favorable to the plan and want to be counted as one of those who believes Dean Acheson has done a magnificent job. He is the greatest Secretary of State that we have had in many many years. At some future time I expect to speak at length on the leadership which Mr. Acheson has displayed during his tenure in the Department of State.

In my opinion, the Republican Party aided by its newspapers and radio outlets is attacking Mr. Acheson for partisan political advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it was once said by that noble Roman, Seneca, that "a great pilot can sail even when his canvas is rent."

The opposition in this House today reminds me of a great wind.

Thirty-six years ago the Cadillac Motor Car Co., of Detroit, placed an advertisement in the Saturday Evening Post. While many years have since passed by, I believe that its word remarkably fit the situation prevailing in this Chamber today—proving once again that there is nothing new under the sun. I wish to read some excerpts from this advertisement for the edification of the House.

In every field of human endeavor, he that is first must perpetually live in the white light of publicity. The reward and the punishment are always the same. The reward is widespread recognition; the punishment fierce denial and detraction. When a man's work becomes a standard for the whole world, it also becomes a target for the shafts of the envious few. If his work be merely mediocre, he will be severely left alone—if he achieve a masterpiece, it will set a million tongues a-wagging.

The leader is assailed because he is a leader, and the effort to equal him is merely added proof of that leadership. Failing to equal or excel, the follower seeks to depreciate or destroy, but only confirms once more the superiority of that which he strives to supplant. There is nothing new in this. It is as old as the world and as old as human passions—envy, fear, greed, ambition, and the desire to surpass. And it all avails nothing. If the leader truly leads, he remains the leader. That which is good or great makes itself known, no matter how loud the clamor of denial. That which deserves to live—lives.

I call upon the supporters of this amendment to abandon it and to stand up like men in constitutional impeachment proceedings to achieve their objective. Longfellow had a word for you, gentlemen, "better like Hector in the field to die, than like perfumed Paris turn and fly."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, when one becomes a public servant, he is always a target. One lives in a glass house. You are subject to a critical review by friend and foe. Dean Acheson is no exception. His refusal to turn his back on Hiss will long be remembered.

Here is a man who has been Secretary of State, and a poll taken of the American people would indicate that this man has lost the confidence of the American people. It does seem to me we have enough red-blooded Americans in this country to do the job of carrying on these functions of the State Department without using people whose loyalty is questioned. The straightforward way to get rid of Acheson would be by impeaching him. I would be the first one to vote for impeachment. I do not suppose that could be accomplished, because the machinery of impeachment is quite cumbersome. A New Deal committee and judge would stop all procedures.

A man who has so universally lost the confidence of the American people ought to be replaced. I think from a political standpoint it is better for the Republicans to keep him in, he is good ammunition, but for the good of the country a man who has been in the position he now finds himself should no longer be Secretary of State. The people should impeach this man and the administration in 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, why do you not put the blame for world conditions where the blame really belongs? Why do you not put it on Joe Stalin and on the Kremlin? It has been stated that the American people have lost faith or confidence in the Secretary of State. They have lost faith, if any have lost faith, because there has been a constant undermining of the Secretary of State.

When the American people realize that we are not in a third world war; that conditions in Korea are looking better and that conditions in the Far East, in Iran, for instance, which has been an explosive can of dynamite with a very short fuse, are improving; when they realize that our international relationship there is looking up, there cannot help but be great confidence in our foreign relations. What more do they want?

Who in the world in this Chamber wants to be Secretary of State?

Certainly I do not and not one of you because it is a tremendous—an impossible job. One certainly without gratitude. No one knows from day to day what Joe Stalin is going to do. I squirm when I think of what you are trying to do to Secretary Acheson. I am just wondering what makes you say what you do. I would hate to say some of the things that have been said about him. Why do not you who are for this amendment produce evidence and facts and forget generalities?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I approach the question of this amendment with mixed feelings because I have known Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State, for over 40 years and naturally I have a personal affection for him. I believe he is a sincere American; there is no doubt about the brilliancy of his mind and his ability as a lawyer, but in the position which he now holds he is about as unfit as anyone that I can imagine. Unfortunately for himself and most unfortunately for the country, he has made statements which prompt people to question his loyalty and he has undoubtedly given too much weight to the opinions expressed by the representatives of Great Britain. The tried and true foreign policy of our country has been violated in various ways and the people, as well as many Members of Congress, are bewildered by the trend of events which do not reflect the real sturdy Americanism of our forefathers.

The simple fact is that the citizens of this country have lost confidence in the State Department and the Secretary of State, and when the people of this great Republic lose confidence in their executives the whole system of our republican form of government is in jeopardy. The President has seen fit to ignore the attitude of the people in this matter and that makes it all the more serious. It is hard to understand with the situation as it is, why the President still places his confidence and trust in a man occupying such a responsible position who is totally out of touch with the country.

The present amendment, however, is the wrong way to eliminate Dean Acheson from the Government. Frankly, I have no better way to suggest, which, of course, places me in a weak position, but under our system of government and our procedure the Senate investigates the qualifications of the appointments to the President's Cabinet and, if they are acceptable to the Senate, there is no way that the legislative branch can remove them except by impeachment, and under the law Acheson has done nothing to warrant impeachment proceedings.

If such a law, as provided in the amendment submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], had been on our statute books in years gone by, our Government would have been deprived of the services of such great men as Elihu Root, Charles Evans Hughes, and Henry L. Stimson, to name a few which come to my mind. That would have been a shocking loss to the country.

I think the amendment, while well meant and submitted in the best of faith by one of the finest men in the House, is contrary to orderly procedure and not in the best interests of our country. For these reasons, I shall vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McGUIRE].

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, but in order that you should know how I stand with the State Department, I am the one who threw the meeting into confusion about a year ago when the State Department invited the Members of Congress to come out to former Secretary Forrestal's home and I suggested that we recognize Spain and that we have a representative at the Vatican. So, I guess you know how I stand with the Office of the Secretary of State. But, as a former Democratic State chairman of Connecticut, I feel it is my duty to say that I know that Dean Acheson's father was the Episcopal bishop of Connecticut, one of the most revered clergymen in all the history of that State. In regard to the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] about Dean Acheson's dual citizenship, I just telephoned Mr. Acheson and he does not have dual citizenship. The only citizenship he has is that of being a citizen of the United States of America. He was born in Middletown, Conn., one of the finest towns I have ever seen, on April 11, 1893. I have listened with interest to the Republicans hoping that they could have bipartisan representation in the State Department. I hope we can get the same number of Democrats down there as there are Republicans if there is a change, because it will be an improvement for the Democratic Party.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUIRE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. In other words, the situation is about this: The amendment would ask us to repeat the decision of Pontius Pilate and send some one to the cross.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the first Members of the Congress to insist in March of last year that the Secretary of State be fired simply because I thought he had done a miserable job. However, I would like to ask my Republican friends this question: How long do you think his policies would have been implemented, good, bad, or indifferent, if they had not had the approval of the Chief Executive of this country? Therefore, you are directing your fire at the wrong person. If you do not like Acheson's policies, do you not know that if he were fired, either by your amendment or otherwise, his superior would not replace him with someone who would not agree with the President? That seems obvious to me. I do not see any particular point in firing a hired hand who will be replaced by the same boss simply because you disagree with the policy of the hired hand. Our foreign policy or the lack of one may be the technical work of the Secretary of State but, in the final analysis, the President must accept responsibility for it.

As much as I would like to see the Secretary of State replaced by someone who could command the confidence of the American people, I do not agree with the method of getting rid of him that is proposed by this amendment. I do not want

my vote against this method of getting rid of him to be construed as any vote of confidence on my part in him or the policy of appeasement he represents.

The only fair way the Congress has of getting rid of an official of the Executive Department is that of impeachment as provided by the Constitution. That is the method you should employ if you really want to rid this country of Mr. Acheson but there, again, you would be faced with the fact that the man who appointed the Secretary would not appoint a successor who disagrees with the administration's foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, very little can be said by me now that will add to what has already been said. In my opinion what is proposed to be done by the Phillips amendment would be a futile act. I have given thoughtful consideration to the proposal in trying to determine what I should do about it. It is my considered judgment that the passage of this proposed amendment would be nullified by the Supreme Court, on the authority of the case of *United States v. Lovett* (328 U. S. Reports 303). Briefly, in that case it was sought to take three persons off the State Department payroll in a manner similar to the amendment before us. There the specific persons were named, here they are not.

In deciding that the action taken in that case was in effect a bill of attainder and consequently unconstitutional, the Supreme Court relied on two cases in support of its conclusion. They were *Cummings v. Missouri* (4 Wall. 277) and *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333). In its decision the Court stated—page 315:

Neither of these cases has ever been overruled. They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution.

While the Secretary is not specifically mentioned in the proposed amendment, certainly a reading of the debate on it will disclose that this amendment is directly pointed at the object of removing Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. The Court rendered its decision by a unanimous vote, although one Justice did not participate. Six concurred in the main opinion and two agreed upon a concurring opinion that arrived at the same conclusion but did not declare the statute unconstitutional.

Today we witnessed the taking of the oath of a new member. We all solemnly take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Consequently, in good conscience we must vote against a proposition that we feel is contrary to the Constitution. That is the way I feel.

There is another matter that I am thinking of in connection with this amendment. I want my party, the Republican Party, in the best possible political posture next year. Prominent men of both Houses of Congress of the Democratic faith have publicly declared and written that the Secretary of State is a

distinct liability to the administration and should be removed. To make a move to remove him, which later would be declared void would make the Republican Party look as though they did not know what they are doing. We are not sent to Congress to practice futility. If we cannot, because of constitutional inhibitions, do a thing that our constituents think we should do or our judgment tells us we should do, we should be courageous enough to face the situation and notify our constituents of the impossibility of the proposed action.

Our Government is one of limited powers. The powers of Congress are limited. The Constitution specifically provides that bills of attainder and ex post facto laws are unconstitutional. Several times we have done things that have been highly publicized and by some persons lavishly praised. Later we have been rudely shocked to find that these acts were illegal, such as the case of the removal of Lovett, Watson, and Dodd. Then people begin to wonder if we in Congress know what we are about. Also, if such policies are sponsored by Republican members the people naturally wonder whether our party knows what it is doing. I want the posture of our party to be such that in 1952 we will have a change in administration, which the great mass of our people are craving for. No political group should be in power for 20 years and practically everyone I know believes that. My hope is that we Republicans will by our record convince the people in 1952 that we have earned the right to be trusted with the management of the Federal Government. These are some of the thoughts that motivated my decision to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, those of my good Republican colleagues who are opposing this amendment claim they do so on the assumption, which I think is a correct one, that this is not the way to accomplish their purpose. This is an unconstitutional method, so held by the Supreme Court, and is really a useless waste of time. I base my opposition to the amendment on the same grounds as the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I want to compliment him on his statement.

I think Mr. Acheson has been an outstanding Secretary of State, and one of the best we have ever had. I think he has done a great job. I am directing my remarks now to the members of the Republican Party in this body and throughout the country, and I tell you that if you would stop your sniping and give him a chance and let him do his job, you would find he is doing a real job, and he will do an even better job, as the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] said, if you would only give him the opportunity. The situation in the Far East is looking up. I venture to say if you will only stop your incessant, unfounded criticisms and let him concentrate on his official duties, he will do a great job, and we will have peace in the world. But by keeping on what you are doing, you are playing right into the hands of Soviet Russia and

the Communists, which I am sure you would not want to do.

Let us all forget partisanship at this perilous time in world affairs and concentrate on unity, both here and abroad, and we will have a better world to live in.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Towle].

Mr. TOWLE. Mr. Chairman, I am not in sympathy with the foreign policy of the present administration. As a matter of fact, I think it has gotten us into great difficulty throughout the world, and if pursued will continue to involve us in many areas where we ought not to be.

Under our form of government, however, the President is entitled to select his Cabinet members and he also, of course, must take the responsibility for their actions.

I do not believe that the adoption of the Phillips amendment could possibly accomplish a change in our foreign policy. It does, of course, give each Member an opportunity to express himself, but that it all.

I repeat again that I do not favor the foreign policy of the present administration, but I cannot support the Phillips amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, there has been an unfortunate record made in this House today. In spite of the fact that we may expunge from the RECORD the remarks that were objected to, the fact remains that the public will know it in the press tomorrow. The unfortunate part of it is that the other side of the aisle, under the management of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], must resort to such tactics to accomplish their ends in this particular issue. The contrast is so evident between the kind of language the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] used when he was on the floor explaining his amendment, compared with the type of language used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

I doubt if any other nation on earth would retain in office a man as unpopular as Dean Acheson is, who has lost the confidence of the American people. The Democrats say we should impeach Dean Acheson rather than adopt the Phillips amendment. We know, and they know, that impeachment proceedings would never be acted upon by this Congress, under control of the Democratic Party. They are saying this to avoid action on the Phillips amendment.

Since we cannot obtain action on impeachment proceedings, the only action left to us to express our opposition to Acheson is by voting for the Phillips amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a Democrat from the great Southwest to oppose the Phillips amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot join with my Republican friends in their partisan attempt to remove Secretary of State Acheson from his office by means of

withholding his salary. This I feel is a devious method of obtaining that which should be sought directly, and too flagrant a violation of the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Dodd case, among others.

Therefore, I cannot fail to rise here on this floor to disavow this attempt and to say to my colleagues and my country that I am not a party to it. Let this not be interpreted as an endorsement of all that Mr. Acheson has done. It is not. But it is an expression of opposition to the means being used and the methods being employed.

I oppose the Phillips amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. May I compliment the gentleman on his courage and his judgment. I join him in the sentiments he has expressed and in taking an action here which I doubt is popular in his area. It may not be popular in mine. But there is a principle involved, and I admire the gentleman for his statement. This is not the approach, either legally or morally, and I feel this is a test between right and wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman very much, and agree with him thoroughly. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what is involved in this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is actually an attempt to change our constitutional form of government into a parliamentary government, the type of government which they have in England. The gentleman is trying to make the Secretary of State directly responsible to the Congress, as would be the case in any of those countries which follow the parliamentary system of government. Under that system the cabinet members are members of parliament and the cabinet is responsible directly to parliament which can remove it by a "no confidence" vote. But under our constitutional system the correct way to remove a cabinet officer, if he should be removed, is through impeachment proceedings. The President of the United States is elected directly in this country and this amendment actually, shorn of subterfuge, is an attack upon the constitutional powers and prerogatives of the President of the United States. It is part of the political campaign of next year. Two of the gentlemen from the Republican Party in speaking for the amendment have referred to polls which they say indicate that Secretary Acheson is unpopular and should be removed from office. But the people polled were not asked if they would resort to unconstitutional means to remove him. These gentlemen, in referring to polls and asserting that polls show Mr. Acheson is unpopular—those gentlemen should remember that polls have been wrong before. I do not think the Republican Party ought to be relying too much on polls right now, after what has happened to them in the past. We want neither the parliamentary form of government substituted for our constitutional system by appropriation statutes,

nor government by polls. This proposed amendment is bad irrespective of your opinion of the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but say that we have been very careful this afternoon to insist upon strict compliance with our rules of procedure so as not to personally offend one another. And this in spite of the fact that we are here to defend ourselves. We can get up and refute any statement or charge which we do not like. But the Secretary of State is not here, and some of the cruelest, meanest things that could be said have been said about him while he cannot be here to defend himself. It is easy but cowardly and inconsistent to demand that we treat each other respectfully while permitting some of our members to personally attack the Secretary of State from the comfortable and safe well of the House where charges or accusations cannot be made the basis of a suit for slander or libel.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the amendment now pending. I sincerely hope it will be defeated.

However, several weeks ago, on June 7, I wrote a weekly newsletter to the papers of my district, in which I tried to analyze the problem of public sentiment as it affects Dean Acheson both in our district and State and nationally. I came to the personal conclusion that our foreign policy, that our Nation, that public sentiment would be benefited by a new Secretary of State. Yet, I think the tactics now attempted by this amendment are out of bounds and unjustified. I think the tactics being used today are exactly the tactics that have made the Republican Party so successful at remaining the minority party in our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this amendment. I shall do so for the simple reason that it is not only the American way and our tradition to allow every man a fair trial in open court, but it is the law of the land under our Constitution. In this particular instance Mr. Acheson is not being accorded a trial. He is being tried all right, but in absentia. The right and proper way to proceed is to introduce your impeachment proceedings here in the House of Representatives. Such action will accord the accused a fair and open trial before the Senate of the United States, who under the Constitution must sit as a jury. I urge this House to give to the Secretary his day in court. Why, no fair-minded, unbiased person would think of convicting the most hardened criminal or even a sheep-killing dog without an opportunity to be tried before a jury and to be represented by counsel.

As I stated the day before yesterday here on the floor in debate on this subject, I now repeat. I do not hold any brief for the Secretary. I have never been an admirer of Mr. Acheson, but I shall not allow my own personal feelings

to sway or dwarf my sense of fairness. Your approach here is nothing more than ambushing the man from the rear. If you challenge the Secretary to a duel, serve notice on him, and then shoot it out face to face. Please do not follow your present method, for it smacks of foul play. It might even be considered as a shot in the back. The Congress of the United States is the last place such questionable action should be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the several years I have been here, I have never encountered such an appalling lack of conscience as is being exhibited here. I have the highest regard for many of the Members on the other side and for the great party they represent. To see them deliberately, admittedly participate in a known unconstitutional act is the most disheartening, discouraging, and shocking exhibition that I have ever experienced as an American.

Let me add this. This is the language of the Supreme Court of the United States. They who support the amendment know that every word I say is true. There is no lawyer here who will not agree. The Supreme Court said:

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to exist in any nation of free men then envisioned, and so they, the forefathers of this Nation, proscribed against bills of attainder.

There is not a man in this House, there is not a lawyer here worthy of the name, who does not know that that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Marshall].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, a friend of mine recently returned from Europe. In fact, last Saturday he sat in my office and told me how amazed he was to find out how interested the people in Europe were in the Congress of the United States. The Congress of the United States means something to those people. It is a symbol. It is the greatest legislative body in the world. We have two major philosophies of thought in the world today: One, in the Soviet Union, that says a man is guilty until he is proven innocent; and we have our American way that says that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty.

A favorable vote on the Phillips amendment today and the people of Europe are going to understand that we are assuming the ways of the Soviet Union. Our people will understand that. That is a fundamental principle that they understand and they respect that we have denied a man his day in court; that we have refused to give him justice.

I have confidence that the Phillips amendment is going to be defeated. Why? Because I have confidence that the majority of this House is composed of people who believe in good sportsmanship, fair play, and justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that if the Republicans wanted to give the Secretary of State his day in court, they have the means whereby they can do that, if they want to, and if they have the grounds to work on, by bringing impeachment proceedings against him? That is the honest way to do it, if they want to get rid of him.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe there has been sufficient debate on the Phillips amendment. I ask that we have a vote on it, and I urge that the Phillips amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] is recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are a number of Members of this House who are Republicans who do not favor this amendment. I have always taken pride, as I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the House, in the high character of the debate that has taken place in this body in connection with all of the legislation relating to our foreign affairs.

This amendment we know cannot stand the test of the courts, because that has already been passed upon. It seems difficult for me to believe that a majority of the Members of this House without regard to party and without regard to feelings or emotional reactions are going to vote for this amendment with the knowledge that such an amendment, should it become law, could not stand the test of the courts.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is a hard fighter, but he is a man whose intent is very kind. What has happened here today, of course, was the result not of any intent on his part, but because of ardor of my friend from New York and his intense disposition to fight for the cause in which he believes.

Now, a few brief words with reference to Secretary Acheson. In my opinion unfortunately he made one statement of a regrettable nature. I am not going to condemn any person on one statement, or on one act, but as we view his record outside of that statement, look at the substance of his leadership as Secretary of the State and view his statements as an individual, his record is an outstanding one in the service of the country during this crisis. No one should be judged on one act or utterance. In justice to Secretary Acheson I want to make the statement which constitutes the views that I have about him.

In any event, on this amendment without regard to our party affiliation, knowing that it cannot be maintained in the courts, I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Phillips].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Phillips) there were—ayes 81, noes 171.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ford: Page 58, line 15, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 602. None of the funds provided in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger-carrying vehicle (other than a bus, station wagon, or ambulance): *Provided further*, That this proviso shall not apply with respect to any person whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur for a Cabinet officer; to situations where other mode of transportation is not feasible; to direct law-enforcement activities, and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, and reserve it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is practically identical with similar amendments that have been offered and approved in the other body. I think in the first instance the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson] sponsored the amendment. It is my recollection that it is part of practically every appropriation bill that has been considered and enacted by the other body.

The reason for the amendment is rather obvious. If you will turn to page 6320 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, you will find a summary of the chauffeurs and drivers for passenger motor vehicles owned and operated by the Federal Government as of the beginning of the fiscal year 1951.

This particular appropriation bill that we have before us pertains to the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the judiciary.

Let us take some figures in reference to each department excepting the judiciary. According to a chart, inserted in the RECORD on June 8, it shows that the Department of Commerce in the District of Columbia had 21 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers. In the field, outside of the District of Columbia, they had 4 such employees, making a total of 25.

The Department of Justice in the District of Columbia had 14 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers. They had none in the field, making a total of 14 for the entire Department.

The Department of State in the District of Columbia had 17 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers. In the field outside of the District of Columbia the Department of State had 13 such employees, making a total of 30 altogether.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Would the gentleman's amendment have the effect of preventing an American ambassador in Europe having a chauffeur for his car?

Mr. FORD. The amendment, I believe, would. It excepts Cabinet officers, it excepts others connected with direct law-enforcement activities, and specifically except the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand from the press that in some other countries our representatives are not permitted to have a chauffeur, except if he be a native of the country where the ambassador or representative is acting.

Mr. FORD. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, in reading these totals I would come to the conclusion that even under the present set-up the ambassadors do not have full-time drivers or chauffeurs.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I have listened very attentively to this debate. I think the amendment is fair and reasonable in scope, and I think it is a way that we can save some money for this Government in this present emergency. I hope that all Members, regardless of party, will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the gentleman from Kentucky and my colleagues that it has become to be a very objectionable situation in the District of Columbia with so many of these Government limousine, of sizable design and style, running around here with full-time chauffeurs and other employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask if this applies to employees in the District of Columbia or all over the world?

Mr. FORD. It applies to any agency covered in this bill, excepting the Cabinet officer himself, the law-enforcement agencies or activities, and specifically the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I would gather thereby that it would be applicable any place where these various agencies operated throughout the world.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We are holding hearings in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], which seeks to put all the automotive equipment of the Government under the control of the General Services Administration.

We had some testimony 2 days ago on this very point. They pointed out that they were now inaugurating in quite a number of departments the pool system and thereby eliminating a lot of these cars that are assigned to individuals. I agree with the gentleman. I do not think these cars should be assigned to individuals, but I think where a chauffeur pool is maintained for the benefit of the agency that has proven to be effective. They have, as I understand, installed in the Department of State, for instance, a two-way radio system and a pool system. All cars are pooled with possibly one or two exceptions. They operate on the same two-way radio system that the taxicabs operate on, and thereby get the maximum use out of the cars.

Mr. FORD. I think the inclusion of this amendment by the other body on several appropriation bills has had a salutary effect in generating activity for the formation of Government car pools. Heretofore they just have not been getting around to such programs. It is a long-needed innovation in the handling of Federal equipment in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. While I am not ready yet to say that I think the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio is perfect, I respect the intent of it and have called hearings on this subject. I do believe we will come out with a piece of legislation which will be directed to this point, and it will cover all the agencies of Government, not just the agencies covered in this bill.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I think there is a great merit in the gentleman's amendment. I just want to be sure that we know just exactly where we are at. Does the gentleman seriously think, for example, that Mr. Walter Gifford should drive his own car around London, and that Mr. Bruce should drive his own car around Paris?

Mr. FORD. There must be some other employee who is not a full-time chauffeur who could do it. My amendment affects only full-time chauffeurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

KEEP FAITH WITH THE PEOPLE: REMOVE ACHESON

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, from what has previously been said, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and others,

and it was said several times during the course of debate on this bill, it might be inferred that those of us who were in favor of the Phillips amendment were guilty of some kind of reprehensible conduct.

Those who urged that we were proceeding in a manner which required action which would not be constitutional, we will assume were sincere in their beliefs. That is, that they really thought that what we were trying to do and the method used was improper or as some said contrary to the Constitution.

I can see nothing wrong ethically, or in any other way, with an attempt to cut off funds for a group or class of persons that we do not like, do not want, and who are following a policy we think is not only bad but serious. I have been wondering whether, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from California had provided that none of the money should be expended in payment for the services of individuals who are members of the Communist Party if that would have been improper?

If we assume that Secretary of State Dean Acheson is one of the most patriotic of men, that his sole purpose is to serve the interest of his country, that he is a man of extraordinary intellectual ability, it is still true that our present dangerous position in international affairs is the result of policies which he and his advisers conceived, formulated, and followed.

Whatever may have been his motive or his purpose, we have been maneuvered into a position where it is said that upon the shoulders of our people—150,000,000—rests the duty and the obligation of imposing our form of government, our way of life, upon other nations—other peoples.

He and those who have been associated with him, either as superiors or as subordinates, are responsible for the present situation of Russia in world affairs—for the fact that Russia is, some say, our equal—others insist, our superior—in military might. That policy makes it possible for her to now threaten the peace of the world, the continued existence of the Republic.

The Acheson-Marshall policy, as it has been characterized, is responsible for the dilemma in which we now find ourselves—engaged in a war in Korea which our people neither desired nor through their Representatives declared and from which, to date, we know not how to extricate ourselves.

It may be said that neither Marshall nor Acheson, being subordinate to the President and Commander in Chief, conceived or activated the foreign policy which we have followed. But whether that policy originated with them or was voluntarily implemented by them, or whether they acted under orders, both were, and are, free Americans and, if they believed the policies which they were following were detrimental to the interests of our country, in justice to themselves and to the country which they served, they should have resigned.

As the fighting in World War II approached the end, as it was apparent that the power of Germany was broken, that Japan was suing for peace, the policy

which was followed by the State Department stopped our victorious armies on their march into Berlin, gave to Russia a foothold in Eastern Germany and, though her aid to win victory over Japan was not needed, permitted her to share in the victories of the Far East, ultimately gave her China and established communism there.

It was and it is the policy of the State Department which gave us and continues the Marshall plan, which calls year after year for billions of dollars to aid in feeding, clothing, housing, educating, and raising the standard of living of millions of people all over the world.

It is the policy of the State Department which called for the surrender of our sovereignty, of our independence as a Republic, for our membership in United Nations.

It is the policy of the State Department which calls for the fighting of an undeclared war, for an undisclosed objective, which has caused the death of thousands of Americans and the cost of which in dollars, supply, suffering and life no one can accurately estimate.

It is the policy of the State Department which now demands the conscription of millions of Americans, to be transported and maintained in Europe, over years which no one even ventures to number.

As a result of the policy of the State Department, free Americans are being regimented, shoved and pushed around at the will of appointed, not elected, bureaucrats, and upon their shoulders is imposed a tax burden which ultimately may destroy us, bring the end which Stalin desires. For Stalin knows, as should we, that the danger of this Republic, as has so often been pointed out by our great statesmen, lies not in aggression by a foreign foe, but in our neglect or refusal to follow the principles enunciated in the Constitution, the example set by our forefathers, when by work, thrift and individual sacrifice, they made secure the freedom and the prosperity which we as a people have heretofore enjoyed.

The foregoing is but a partial and a very brief statement of some of the results of following the policies of the State Department, of which Dean Acheson is the head.

A few months ago our constituents in overwhelming numbers demanded that Secretary of State Acheson be removed; that the President be impeached if he refused to remove him.

We have been told that the Secretary of State does not intend to resign, that the President does not intend to ask for his resignation. It has been pointed out that there are insufficient votes to impeach and convict the Secretary of State.

Members of Congress have bitterly criticized Dean Acheson. They have repeatedly demanded his resignation. It is more than probable that, if the opinion of individual Congressmen could be secretly ascertained, an overwhelming majority would favor his removal from office either voluntarily or by request.

The State Department has lost the confidence of the American people. That confidence is absolutely necessary if we

are to have a people united behind a foreign policy. The country will never willingly unite behind Acheson. They do not trust him.

If a majority of the Members of Congress sincerely desire that some other individual head the State Department, they now have the opportunity to make that desire effective.

That which the Congress creates, the Congress can abolish. In 1789 the Congress declared:

There shall be at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the "Department of State," and a Secretary of State, who shall be the head thereof (Revised Statutes, sec. 199).

The State Department exists because and only because of legislation enacted by the Congress.

The Constitution provides that—

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

It may be true that Congress cannot by direct action remove Secretary of State Acheson but it certainly has authority to abolish the office which he holds and it is equally certain that the Department cannot function except as the Congress appropriates money for that purpose.

It is idle to say that the Congress cannot cause Mr. Acheson to be removed.

It is doubtful if the President, Congress putting to him squarely the issue of whether he call for the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson or face a situation where the Department of State, the office of a Secretary of State, was abolished, would refuse to ask Dean Acheson to resign.

Boiled down, the issue is whether the Congress has the courage and the determination to insist upon the resignation or removal of a Secretary of State in whom the people have lost confidence and who has, over an extended period of time, been sympathetic toward the policies of Communist Russia, or whether it will permit Mr. Truman to continue in office a man whose policies, whatever may have been his motive or purpose, have permitted a communistic-dominated Russia to threaten the people of the world—the security of our Republic.

It is unfortunate that a majority of the Congress will not now, when opportunity offers, take action which will oust Mr. Acheson.

A TEST OF SINCERITY

When Douglas MacArthur was so abruptly relieved of his command in the Far East by President Truman, hundreds of thousands of our constituents protested that action and demanded that Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who was believed to be responsible for that action, be removed.

Many of us advised our constituents that we agreed with them in their statement that Acheson had lost the confidence of the American people and should be removed. We promised to do everything we could to see that he was removed. Have we lost our courage or do we now want more of the Acheson-Marshall policy?

The votes necessary to remove Dean Acheson are not available but the same purpose can be accomplished by telling Mr. Truman that we will not provide funds for the operation of the State Department as long as Acheson directs its activities.

If it be said that such a procedure which would cut off funds for other departments would be unfair and unjustified, the answer is that, until such an attitude be taken, until we show by our acts that we are sincere and will act, the Executive can and always will force its policies and personnel upon the Congress by including in every appropriation bill an appropriation for departments which are not under criticism.

Only by sending an appropriation bill back to committee with specific instructions can the Congress regain its authority to determine the policies to be followed by an executive department.

To prove our sincerity when we promised to take every effective action to remove Acheson, should we not now avail ourselves of this opportunity—force the President to remove Acheson, the friend of Hiss. Which does the President desire—the confidence of the people or the retention of Acheson as Secretary of State? He cannot have both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am quite surprised that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], for whom I have the greatest respect and who has a great deal of real ability, should offer this ill-advised amendment.

If I make any misstatement with regard to the figures I am about to quote, I trust the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will ask me to yield to him, but I believe I have the same figures he has.

Insofar as the Department of State is concerned in this amendment, and considering our important overseas activities covering the whole world, this amendment would apply to exactly two American full-time chauffeurs. It would apply, however, to 443 overseas foreigners, both full time and part time, paid out of the Department salaries and expenses appropriation. Now, overseas, throughout our 300 diplomatic posts, we must have locals driving our cars. If there is an accident, it is not proper, it is not the feasible thing to have an American driving our embassy car. If he were to run down a youngster he would involve us in all sorts of ill feeling with the people of that city or nation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The chart which I have, which was prepared by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and was received by Senator FERGUSON from the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, is on page 6320. The chart shows that for the Department of State there were, as

of the date mentioned in my remarks, 30 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know where Senator FERGUSON got the information on which he embarked on his expedition, as the result of which he proposes to save a handful of dollars. But I assure you the figures I have from the Department of State show number of overseas chauffeurs fiscal year 1952 budgeted under departmental salaries and expenses: American, full time, 1; American, part time, 1. Locals, full time, 382; part time, 61.

Let me interrupt myself here to say that I have been most critical of the business of all these Government cars and chauffeurs traveling around Washington. We see them up here on the Hill every day. We can save money with regard to some of them, but I believe in saving money sensibly.

Let us take the Department of Justice, in which is included the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal Prison System, and other highly important branches of our Government. The Department itself has in the District of Columbia exactly 10 chauffeurs. They have 6 cars, 2 station wagons, and 4 trucks for mail, and so forth, which those 10 chauffeurs drive. Do you think it is sensible to cut them out?

Although the FBI is excepted under the terms of the gentleman's amendment, I might point out that there are only five chauffeurs in the FBI in Washington.

In the Immigration and Naturalization Service here in Washington there are only nine chauffeurs.

In the Bureau of Prisons there is only one.

These are the facts. Mr. Chairman, I do not like this business here in the District of Columbia of too many chauffeur-driven cars any more than anyone else, but let us be sensible about this pending amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It would seem to me that if the time of the people affected by this amendment is worth anything, the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

With regard to the people whom this amendment affects, the 443 foreigners I mentioned a while ago, they are mostly paid overseas from counterpart funds. Is it not more sensible to use foreigners to drive our embassy cars in many places overseas and pay them out of our surplus property credits rather than have those credits remain unused and probably never collected?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Is it not a fact that the average salary of such employee overseas is about \$1,200 or \$1,300 a year?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not believe it is that high.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the so-called Ford automobile amendment be voted down as ill-advised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 97, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 58, after line 14, add the following new sentence:

"None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay an assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the so-called Phillips amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I offered an amendment which was identical in purpose with the amendment I now offer; however, the amendment which I offered on yesterday was hastily drawn, I confess, and was subject to a point of order.

I am therefore resubmitting the amendment to the House and honestly ask your serious consideration. The purpose of the amendment is to place a ceiling on the United States proportionate share of funds to maintain these international organizations. I think it is fair—I think it is proper—that the United States should be called upon to pay its proportionate share; by the same token, I believe that it is unfair and improper that we should be called upon to pay a disproportionate share, particularly in view of the fact that we are fighting 95 percent of the United Nations war in Korea today.

A study was made last year by both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body on the subject of America's proportionate contribution to these various organizations. We find from this report which accompanied House Joint Resolution 334, Eighty-first Congress, that contributions of the United States to various international organizations have ranged from 4 percent to more than 75 percent. We find that the United Nations, which I understand is composed of some 59 or 60 member nations, was being supported during the fiscal year 1950 to the extent of 39.89 percent by the United States. That, I repeat, is not to mention the thousands of American boys who have died on the battlefields of Korea, fighting alongside the token 5 percent contribution of the United Nations in manpower.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman should be complimented on offering this amendment, which will place some of our foreign relations more in line with what they should be financially.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. Common sense and fairness, in my opinion, dictates that this amendment, limiting our contributions to 33 1/3 percent of the total, be adopted.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to point out that there are figures in my office which prove that the citizens of other nations have imposed upon them a lower per capita debt than the citizens of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is undoubtedly true. I may say further that the arguments made yesterday to the effect that we are legally bound to support these organizations to any disproportionate extent are completely and wholly, in my opinion, in contradiction of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman that the least a nation should do would be to contribute as much money as its nationals employed at the UNO receive back. Does the gentleman know of any instance where that is not so? From the percentages the gentleman gives of America's contribution, it would indicate that some nations, for their own nationals employed there, received more than those nations put in.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is probably correct. I do not have those figures, but I do know that most of the money that is paid into these organizations by these other countries is given to them by us through the Marshall plan, so that we are actually paying a much greater percentage than might appear on the surface.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Why should we pay 33 1/3 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is just a figure that I drew out of the report I mentioned a while ago. The committee felt that this average was too high, that is, the average that was contributed in 1950, of 35.35 percent. Then Mr. Hickerson, of the State Department, appeared before the committee and testified—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And Mr. Hickerson said that his reference during testimony to 33 1/3 percent was the amount "which the United Nations General Assembly has recognized as the maximum that any state should in normal times be asked to contribute" to that organization. That was the State Department's word for it, and I think should be the absolute ceiling.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would just like to say that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi is not without precedent, because in the supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House here about 4 weeks ago that ceiling, the exact percentage which the gentleman has in his amendment, was imposed on one of the international funds, for the agency which worked through the United Nations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Along the line suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] a while ago, is it not a fact that the United States owes more money than all the rest of the world put together; that our national debt amounts to more than the combined national debts of all other countries of the world put together? If so, then why should we try to finance the world and fight everybody else's wars throughout the world?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell us what good some of these organizations do for the United States of America that would warrant even 33 1/3 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I certainly cannot tell the gentleman. My imagination is not that good.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the Committee two reasons why this amendment should not be adopted. The first reason is that the money appropriated in this bill is for the calendar year 1951. All of these agencies, these international organizations, operate on a calendar-year basis rather than a fiscal-year basis. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would impose 33 1/3 percent on this year's operations, and we have already obligated ourselves to contribute, in the case of

the United Nations, 38.92 percent; the World Health Organization, 35 percent; the Child Welfare Organization, 35.7 percent, and UNESCO, 35.5 percent. However, next year's contributions have been lowered to exactly one-third, 33 1/3 percent, in every organization under the United Nations, but not so for this year. Now, several programs are under way. Various programs operated by these specialized agencies are being conducted, and where we, of necessity, default for 6 months, because we do not appropriate until July 1, they are using funds out of the working capital fund which will be repaid when the United States Government makes its contribution. Consequently, this amendment would of necessity force a curtailment of operations or cessation of programs that are half way through, that have already been started.

Of course, it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to stop the program in the very middle of it or during the latter part of the year. Second, if we adopt this amendment, it is going to be accepted as a fair figure, and there will be little incentive left for delegates representing the United States to these various conferences to seek a lower figure, because this will in effect say that 33 1/3 is a fair percentage for the United States Government to contribute. I do not think that is true. I think we should continue to strive to bring these contributions down below the 33 1/3-percent level.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the House should know that the gentleman now addressing us is an advocate of economy in government. The proof lies in the fact that he was responsible for getting a reduction in this Government's budget appropriation to UNESCO this year, and has worked toward that end in years past for all international commissions and agencies.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for the compliment. I did make the motion in Paris on the part of the United States Government to reduce our contribution to one-third, thereby saving us for the remaining years the sum of \$435,000 annually. After a long debate, requiring all of 1 day, the proposition was finally carried. That will be our contribution after this year. But please bear in mind that voting for this amendment now would disturb the program of every specialized agency in the United Nations, and such as the Pan-American Union, the Pan-American Railway Congress, the Pan-American Sanitary Organization, the Caribbean Commission, and the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. All of those agencies would be compelled to revise and revamp their program for the remainder of this calendar year. After that the contributions will, as I say, to all of the United Nations organizations be exactly one-third, including WHO, because it was reduced at Geneva. The World Health Organization contribution was reduced at Geneva to one-third this year also.

So I say it is not good business, it is not sensible, to adopt this amendment and cause complete disruption of all of these programs during this year. It would certainly be more sensible to present this amendment to this same bill when it comes up next year. There would be some logic, some reason in that. But at this time it is highly inappropriate and untimely. I ask you to defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I now ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that Members follow the logic advanced by the able and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]. I warn that if we were to adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi it would do more to disrupt the harmonious relations we have with our own good neighbors right here in this hemisphere, with the peoples of Central and South America, than any incident which has happened in over a century.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 117, noes 123.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRESTON and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 155, noes 137.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 58, line 14, insert a colon at the end of the sentence and add the following: "Provided further, That any funds provided by this act shall not be available for the compensation of persons performing information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 75 percent (on an annual basis) of the amount budgeted therefor in the President's budget for 1952. For the purposes of this section the term 'information function' means functions usually performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title; and the term 'related supporting functions' means functions performed by persons who assist persons performing information functions in the drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating of public information, publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, and similar material."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill, legislation

defining terms and functions; therefore, contrary to the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the point of order raised is not pertinent to the purposes of this amendment, which merely places a restriction on the amount of money that might be used where it is being used for publicity purposes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order, but rather explaining his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order. That is the question now before the Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is my view that this amendment is in order and that it is germane to the bill now under consideration. It provides merely for a limitation on this appropriation bill of 25 percent in the amount that can be used.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As it was read, very clearly it is merely a limitation on an appropriation bill; and if that is so, it should be in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has offered an amendment, which has been reported. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it contains legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

While the gentleman may intend the amendment as a limitation, it certainly contains language that goes further than a mere limitation on an appropriation bill. The provision in the amendment seeking to provide a definition, and other language contained in the amendment, is beyond the scope of a limitation on an appropriation bill. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 58, line 15, add a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to the Department of Justice, except General Administrative personnel;

"(e) to the Bureau of Investigation;

"(f) to the judiciary branch;

"(g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

"(h) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2.

Provided further, That when any department or agency covered in this act has re-

duced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of August 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member of this House is familiar with the Jensen amendments which have already been adopted on five appropriation bills.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. In view of the fact that this very amendment has been debated many times since the first appropriation bill was reported this year, I believe everyone here is familiar with the so-called Jensen amendment. We had a roll-call vote on it, as I recall, only yesterday. I wonder if we cannot agree to conclude the debate immediately and vote?

Mr. JENSEN. There are some exemptions here I think I should explain. It will take only a short while.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman asking that all debate on this section be closed or only on the pending amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Merely the Jensen amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Section (d) pertains to the Department of Justice. It exempts the Department of Justice with the exception of general administration personnel.

Section (e) exempts the entire Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Section (f) exempts the entire judiciary branch of the Government.

Section (g) exempts the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Do the exemptions include the border patrol of the Immigration Service?

Mr. JENSEN. It is part of the Justice Department, and is a law-enforcement branch of that Department.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; my amendment would exempt them. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Did not the gentleman tell me earlier in the day when he very kindly let me have a copy of his amendment that it did not apply to our Immigration and Naturalization Service?

Mr. JENSEN. I must have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is exactly the question I asked the gentleman. It ought to exempt the Immigration Service, because today it is woefully undermanned and thousands of aliens are pouring into this country over our border.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it exempts the Department of Justice.

Mr. JENSEN. It exempts the Department of Justice except administration personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to hear that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is excepted.

Mr. JENSEN. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has not increased its personnel in the past number of years, and they have taken on many added responsibilities. So, we exempted the Civil Aeronautics Administration because we tried to encourage those agencies which have done a good job in holding down their employees and hence, their expenditures. Other than that this amendment is identical with the five previous amendments which I offered and which this House has adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that this proposed Jensen amendment would include our Foreign Service overseas. Now, if there is any sense, with the world situation as crucial as it is at this time, and with peace in Korea in the offing, to gut our Foreign Service by the terms of this so-called Jensen amendment, then I just do not understand anything. This amendment would gut shoot the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Office of International Trade of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, all of whom have been designated as defense agencies. The gentleman from Iowa has no more idea of the important work on guided missiles and proximity fuzes and other such technical defense matters handled by the Bureau of Standards, which, incidentally, had a great deal to do with our perfection of the first atomic bomb, than the man in the moon.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Jensen amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 142, noes 127.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 58, line 14, insert a colon at the end of the sentence and the following: "*Provided further*, That any funds provided by this Act shall not be available for the compensation of persons performing domestic information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 75 percent of the amount provided herein."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full time allowed me. It is late. I merely want to point out that on three previous occasions the House has adopted amendments designed to limit the amount of money that may be expended for publicity or propaganda purposes.

My amendment merely proposes that not more than 75 percent of the money which is used for publicity purposes shall be used within the fiscal year. That means you have a saving of 25 percent of the amount used for that purpose if my amendment is adopted.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of July 19, 1951]

FREE-LANCE WRITERS PAID \$1,500,000 BY STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Willard Edwards)

The State Department is subsidizing American free-lance writers at a cost of \$1,500,000 a year.

It is providing the major radio-broadcasting systems with another million and one-half a year in income.

Motion-picture companies are collecting \$8,500,000 annually under the State Department's propaganda program.

OTHER GROUPS BENEFITING

So-called public-opinion polls and prominent universities are receiving fat checks for their propaganda services.

Book and magazine publishers are collecting more than \$1,000,000 a year for similar activities.

Libraries and educational institutions are receiving close to \$1,000,000 annually. Press associations, telegraph and cable companies, news-reel companies, television companies, and teletype services get another million a year.

This flow of gold to individuals and organizations which are in a position to control public opinion in the United States is exposed in copies of State Department contracts covering expenditure of approximately \$27,000,000 which have been secured by the Chicago Tribune.

CONCEALED FROM PUBLIC

These contracts, carefully concealed from the public, offer an explanation of why the State Department continues to receive acclaim from certain prominent columnists, radio commentators, spokesmen for the motion-picture industry, university officials, magazine editors and book publishers.

The revelations of Communist influences under State Secretary Acheson and our diplomatic disasters abroad have not stemmed a tide of printed and spoken praise of the State Department.

Disclosure of the contracts indicates that these supporters of Acheson have a financial interest in keeping him in office in addition to their sympathy for his policies.

FREE-LANCE FUND

The contracts cover only a portion of the operations of the State Department's international information and educational activity branch. This is the propaganda unit which includes the Voice of America and it is supposed to spread the American viewpoint throughout the world in opposition to communism. It cost the American people approximately \$100,000,000 in the last 12 months.

But much of the State Department's spending, the evidence reveals is devoted to the judicious allotment of funds to persons and organizations which can impress their opinions upon the American public.

The free-lance writer fund of \$1,500,000 a year has been a jealously guarded State Department secret. When it was first the subject of inquiry at a recent executive session of the House Appropriations Committee, Edward W. Barrett, Assistant State Secretary for Public Affairs, reluctantly conceded that free-lance material was bought to a limited extent. He said he did not know the amount spent for such material.

INFORMATION LATER PROVIDED

The information was later provided. The propaganda branch, it was disclosed, gave \$1,471,593 to free-lance writers in the fiscal year just ended and planned to spend \$1,502,355 in the current fiscal year.

Congressional investigators noted that this fund could be parceled out to newspaper columnists, reporters, radio commentators, magazine writers, and similar professionals who were beating the drums for the State Department.

John L. Dunning, Chief, International Press and Publications Division, was questioned about a \$135,760 fund marked for purchase of specially written byline articles.

"We purchase items from leading American magazine writers," he said, "and from experts in technological fields. We select a writer who is competent to cover the subject, contract with him for the article. He delivers it and we simply send it to our missions in the field by wireless or mail."

CAREFUL COVER-UP

The committee got no information concerning the recipients of the money.

The contracts secured by this newspaper revealed a number of the writers who received money for this type of service. But a careful cover-up was maintained in some instances. One contract, under the heading of the International Broadcasting Division, read merely as follows:

Various scripts for programming.....	\$230,467
Various announcements.....	270,531
Various free-lance artists.....	38,897

A contract with the Washington Post, known in Washington as the State Department's most vociferous defender, showed the payment of \$2,050 for the printing of 50,000 booklets entitled "Herblock Looks at Communism."

Herblock is Herbert Block, Post cartoonist, whose views on communism for a period of years have been expressed in violent attacks against the House Committee on Un-American Activities and all investigations of subversion in the Government.

Other contracts for writing, editing, translations, layouts, art work, cartoons, and research showed the following recipients of State Department funds:

Wynn Stephenson, New York City, \$2,392; Richard Burgi, Chatham, N. Y., \$515; George Debs, Brooklyn, N. Y., \$2,000; Aaron M. Burns, New York City (photos, stories, art work), \$102,033; Kennedy Associates, New York, \$3,800; Eric Godal, New York, \$550; Nina Rittenberg, Seaford, L. I., N. Y., \$900; Simon Menache, New York, \$763; Terry Haas, New York, \$1,853; Richard Schwartz, River Edge, N. J., \$1,933; Peter Palazzo, Staten Island, N. Y., \$1,500; Allen Whiting, Jr., Brooklyn, N. Y., \$500; George Cronyn, New York, \$300.

Harris Peel, Washington, was paid \$440 for articles on the point 4 agreements. Robert Clark Honey, Washington, received \$425 for articles covering the visit of French technicians to the United States. Robert K. Butcher, Washington, received \$500 for articles on Human Rights in the United States.

LUCE PUBLICATIONS

Life magazine, a Henry Luce publication, collected \$500 for an American Revolution pamphlet. Life-Time, Inc., received \$5,169 in another contract and March of Time, a motion-picture affiliate, collected \$2,362 in a contract with the State Department.

Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., received \$7,327 for its services. William O'Riley, San Juan, P. R., received \$1,600 for miscellaneous articles.

Two State Department contracts, each worth \$12,500 to the recipient, have not yet been awarded, the records showed. One is for a tourist behavior booklet, and the other is for a pamphlet on information activities.

The National Society of Seniors, Inc., Washington, received, \$875 for a pamphlet entitled "Life in America for Persons Over 60."

At the time these contracts were signed, the international information and educational branch of the State Department had 5,956 employees on the payroll and was asking for an increase to 9,883 employees for the current fiscal year. The need for contracts such as above, with persons not on the payroll, was not explained by the State Department.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of July 22, 1951]

MOVIE AND NEWS-REEL FIRMS PROFIT UNDER STATE DEPARTMENT PLAN—EVERYONE FROM PRODUCERS TO WRITERS ON GRAVY TRAIN; ACCOUNTING OBSCURE

(By Willard Edwards)

Ten million dollars of the State Department's propaganda fund went last year to the motion picture industry and its employees.

News-reel companies, which devote much of their output to the speeches of President Truman and administration officials, garnered substantial contracts from the fund.

More than 300 script writers received fat checks ranging between \$1,000 and \$14,000 for composing skits to impress foreign people with the American viewpoint.

HAS 6,000 ON PAYROLL

Contracts were awarded to these individuals despite the fact that the State Department employs 6,000 skilled professionals at salaries between \$8,000 and \$12,000 a year to provide the same material.

The subsidizing of free-lance writers, radio broadcasters, book and magazine publishers, universities, and educational societies has been revealed in previous articles. The pouring of funds into the motion picture world has raised the question whether this money was devoted to anti-Communist propaganda abroad or to combat State Department criticism at home.

Secret contracts obtained by the Washington Times-Herald reveal the receipt of large amounts by firms and individuals in the motion picture industry. But mysterious gaps were encountered.

Contracts with 277 individuals, missing from the records, were lumped under the heading: "Miscellaneous \$383,346."

INFORMATION UNAVAILABLE

At another point in the records, there was a brief notation: "Miscellaneous contracts with 21 companies or individuals—\$174,237."

In accounting for expenditure of \$2,244,000 for motion picture equipment, a report merely stated: "Equipment contracted in Paris by American Embassy. Contract information not available."

Members of the House appropriations committee have been baffled in attempts to get more definite information on such details from the State Department. They have demanded the names of all recipients of a mysterious \$1,500,000 fund apportioned last year to free-lance writers.

Investigators suspect that this fund may have been used to increase the income of newspaper columnists, radio commentators, and magazine writers who have been consistent defenders of State Secretary Acheson against charges that his policies have been influenced by Communists in his Department.

DEPARTMENT PAYS WELL

The State Department pays by Hollywood standards when it contracts for the services of movie script writers not on the Federal payroll, the contracts reveal. Here are some of the contracts awarded to individuals in the fiscal year of 1951:

Don G. Williams, \$4,454; Gardner Hart, \$2,500; Jay Dresser, \$3,000; Frank Gulick, \$2,500; Fillimore J. Phipps, \$2,800; Richard L. G. Devereall, \$1,250; Ray Hargrave, \$8,000; George Worford, \$1,500; Sam Rose, \$2,367; Alex Greendale, \$2,367; William O'Brien, \$1,900; Sigmund Miller, \$4,100; Curtis Mitchell, \$2,094; Guy K. Benson, \$2,951; Joseph Krungold, \$5,247; George Axelrod, \$1,892; Sam Locke, \$1,845.

Lester L. Cooper, \$1,690; Alden Stevens, \$2,700; James Schwep, \$13,775; Erskine F. Gilberg, \$1,350; William Dufty, \$5,000; Paul R. Thoma, \$2,875; Paul Alley, \$5,521; Arthur Zegart, \$2,400; Donald C. Cameron, \$1,586; Frederick K. Rockett, \$1,072; Jack Leib, \$4,514; Charles Downs, \$2,550.

\$3,300 PER TRANSACTION

Twenty-nine individuals thus received \$95,800 for their services, an average of \$3,300 a transaction.

Contracts with newsreel companies included the following:

Warner Brothers, Inc., \$67,762; Movietone News, \$3,500; March of Time, \$13,000; RKO-Pathe, \$96,146; Paramount Pictures, \$13,845; Hearst Metrotrone News, \$72,648.

SYRACUSE GETS \$246,121

The largest contract for a motion picture production, the nature of which was not identified, was with Syracuse University for \$246,121. The same university received another contract for an evaluation survey, an attempt to discover if the Voice of America was accomplishing anything.

Other contracts with motion picture companies:

Universal Pictures, \$62,849; Sound Masters, Inc., \$186,249; Cascade Pictures, \$20,449; Columbia Pictures, \$1,000; United World Films, \$2,500; Twentieth Century-Fox, \$1,800; Film Graphics, \$2,000; Educational Film Corp., \$9,200; International Film Foundation, \$24,614; David Robbins Prod., \$14,512; Caravel Prod., \$10,000; Willard Pictures, \$20,493; A. F. Films, Inc., \$10,000; Unity Films, \$5,111; Knickerbocker Prod., \$4,032; Robert Carlisle Prod., \$20,215; Telenews Prod., \$12,847; C. & G. Film Effects Co., \$78,034; Cineffects, Inc., \$85,275; Film Optical, Inc., \$50,682; Q. Q. Motion Picture Titles, \$54,168; Reeves Sound Studios, \$41,815; Emil Velazco, Inc., \$56,189; Victor Animatograph Corp., \$132,582.

The State Department contracted with the Society for Applied Anthropology for a movie script, the nature of which was not supplied. The price was \$40,500.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, apparently the amendment as now drawn is parliamentarily correct.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment because it does not belong in the bill. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 131, noes 137.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Flood and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 154, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4747) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 336 he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 15, line 3, strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 142, nays 245, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—142

Aandahl	Bishop	Cunningham
Abbitt	Blackney	Curtis, Nebr.
Abernethy	Bow	Davis, Ga.
Adair	Bramblett	Davis, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Bray	Devereux
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	D'Ewart
Andersen,	Brownson	Dolliver
H. Carl	Budge	Elston
Anderson, Calif.	Buffett	Fellows
Andresen,	Burdick	Fenton
August H.	Bush	Gamble
Armstrong	Butler	Golden
Ayres	Byrnes, Wis.	Goodwin
Baker	Chenoweth	Gross
Bates, Mass.	Chipfield	Hall,
Beall	Church	Leonard W.
Beamer	Clevenger	Harden
Belcher	Cole, Kans.	Harvey
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Hess
Berry	Crawford	Hill
Betts	Crumpacker	Hillings

Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.
Hoeven	Morano
Hoffman, Mich.	Nicholson
Holmes	O'Hara
Horan	O'Konski
Hull	Ostertag
Jackson, Calif.	Phillips
James	Polk
Jenison	Potter
Jenkins	Poulson
Jensen	Rankin
Jonas	Reece, Tenn.
Kearns	Reed, Ill.
Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.
Latham	Rees, Kans.
LeCompte	Robeson
Lovre	Rogers, Mass.
McConnell	Sadlak
McCulloch	St. George
McDonough	Schwabe
McGregor	Scrivner
McVey	Scudder
Mack, Wash.	Secrest
Martin, Iowa	Shafer
Martin, Mass.	Sheehan
Mason	Short
Meador	Simpson, Ill.
Miller, Md.	Simpson, Pa.

NAYS—245

Addonizio	Forand	McCormack
Albert	Ford	McGrath
Allen, La.	Forrester	McGuire
Andrews	Frazier	McKinnon
Anfuso	Fugate	McMillan
Aspinall	Fulton	McMullen
Auchincloss	Furcolo	Machrowicz
Balley	Garmatz	Mack, Ill.
Bakewell	Gary	Madden
Barden	Gathings	Magee
Baring	George	Mahon
Barrett	Gordon	Mansfield
Bates, Ky.	Graham	Marshall
Battle	Granahan	Marrow
Beckworth	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Bender	Grant	Mills
Bennett, Fla.	Green	Mitchell
Bentsen	Greenwood	Morgan
Blatnik	Gregory	Morris
Boggs, Del.	Hagen	Morrison
Bolling	Hale	Morton
Bolton	Hand	Moulder
Bonner	Hardy	Multer
Bosone	Harris	Mumma
Boykin	Hart	Murdoch
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	Nelson
Bryson	Hays, Ark.	Norrell
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill.
Burleson	Hebert	O'Neill
Burnside	Hedrick	O'Toole
Burton	Heffernan	Passman
Byrne, N. Y.	Heller	Patman
Canfield	Herlong	Patten
Cannon	Herter	Patterson
Carlyle	Heseltun	Philbin
Carnahan	Holfield	Pickett
Case	Hope	Poage
Celler	Howell	Preston
Chelf	Hunter	Price
Chudoff	Jackson, Wash.	Priest
Clemente	Jarman	Prouty
Cole, N. Y.	Javits	Quinn
Combs	Johnson	Rabaut
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Radwan
Cooper	Jones, Mo.	Rains
Corbett	Jones,	Reams
Cotton	Hamilton C.	Redden
Coudert	Jones,	Rhodes
Cox	Woodrow W.	Ribicoff
Crosser	Judd	Richards
Dague	Karsten, Mo.	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Riley
Dawson	Kearney	Rivers
Deane	Keating	Roberts
DeGraffenried	Kee	Rodino
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Dempsey	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Denny	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Dollinger	Kerr	Rooney
Donohue	Kersten, Wis.	Roosevelt
Donovan	Kilday	Sabath
Doughton	King	Sasser
Doyle	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Eberharter	Klein	Scott,
Elliott	Kluczynski	Hugh D. Jr.
Engle	Lane	Seely-Brown
Evins	Lanham	Shelley
Fallon	Lantaff	Sheppard
Feighan	Larade	Sieminski
Fernandez	Lesinski	Sikes
Fine	Lind	Sittler
Fisher	Lucas	Smith, Miss.
Flood	Lyle	Spence
Fogarty	McCarthy	Staggers

Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Sutton
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thornberry
Tollefson

Trimble
Vaughn
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Welch
Wheeler
Whitaker
Whitten

Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Tex.
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—46

Angell
Arends
Boggs, La.
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Busbey
Camp
Chatham
Curtis, Mo.
Denton
Dingell
Dondero
Dorn
Durham
Eaton

Ellsworth
Gavin
Gillette
Gore
Gossett
Gwinn
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Hoffman, Ill.
Irving
Kelley, Pa.
Miller, N. Y.
Murphy

Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Norblad
O'Brien, Mich.
Perkins
Powell
Ramsay
Regan
Saylor
Smith, Kans.
Tackett
Thompson, Tex.
Wier
Wood, Ga.
Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Tackett against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Thompson against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Denton against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Camp against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Angell with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.

Mr. Gillette with Mr. Ramsay.

Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Irving.

Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Norblad with Mr. Wood.

Mr. Saylor with Mr. Wier.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Chatham.

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Regan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 1005

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a committee report on the bill H. R. 1005, and that the minority may have a like privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION OF ADMISSION TAX TO UNIFORMED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4601) to provide that the admission tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is simply confined to the Armed Forces?

PURPOSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. This bill would exempt from admissions tax members of the Armed Forces of the United States in uniform when admitted free of charge to sporting events, moving picture theaters, and any other places subject to the admissions tax. This would be accomplished by amending section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, effective as to admissions on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under present law, persons (including members of the Armed Forces) admitted free or at reduced rates are required to pay the same amount of tax as a person who is charged the regular admissions price with certain minor exceptions. Although H. R. 4473, the revenue bill of 1951 which is now pending in the Senate, would provide an exemption from admissions tax for all persons who are admitted free to various places of amusement, this bill is still the subject of hearings by the Senate Committee on Finance. Your committee believes that an exemption for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in uniform should be enacted as soon as possible. This time of year is the height of the sporting season, and in order for this exemption to be of advantage to servicemen, it should be enacted promptly.

Your committee has been advised that there is considerable reluctance upon the part of persons who are operating ball parks, moving-picture theaters, and other places of amusement to extend the privilege of free admissions to men in uniform because they must still go to the trouble under present law of collecting the admissions tax based upon the established price of admissions to such places. Your committee has also been advised by persons who are in charge of the recreation programs for servicemen that it is sometimes impossible to obtain free admittance for such personnel because of the fact that the Federal Government itself levies a charge for such admissions by way of an admissions tax. During World War II, members of the military and naval forces of the United

States when in uniform were exempted from admissions tax where admissions were free. Restoration of a similar exemption during the current period of mobilization for the national emergency would contribute greatly to the morale of the members of our Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No tax shall be imposed in the case of admission free of charge of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States when in uniform."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable to admissions on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than ten days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCE FUND

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret I did not have a chance to get a vote on my amendment to cut \$350,000 of the funds allocated for what is described as Foreign Service entertainment in the Department of State.

It is my understanding the 1952 budget has requested the following sums for next year: For entertainment, Foreign Service, \$1,000,000; entertainment or representation international information, \$365,000; for ECA, \$350,000; International contingencies, \$100,000; Institute of American Affairs, \$42,000; miscellaneous items, \$23,000. This is a total of more than \$1,800,000. There are probably additional items of similar nature buried elsewhere in the appropriation legislation for the State Department and its associate agencies.

This is a lot of money for so-called entertainment. It is an item that can well be reduced without injury to anyone. In fact, it would be for the best interests of the Department, and it would help the taxpayers to the extent of more than \$300,000.

It is interesting to observe that the item of \$850,000 now included in the bill is described as being required, and I quote from the report, "for entertainment necessary in the conduct of official duties and purchase of flowers, wreaths, and similar tokens for presentation in accordance with local custom on appropriate occasions." The report, of course, does not complete the statement and explain more realistically the purpose for which the funds are used. I should add, however, the hearings indicate more complete information in this respect.

My amendment, if approved, would cut the item of \$850,000 down to \$500,000. The item should be reduced even more. The approval of the reduction by this

House would further indicate that the people of this country, as well as the Congress, are not in favor of increasing unnecessary expenditures. It would also be notice to those who use these funds that they should be expected to hold such expenses in line.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the manner in which these allowances have been increased and approved by this committee in recent years. According to the testimony submitted, this item of entertainment or representation in 1942 was \$163,000. In 1943 it was \$185,000, and in 1944, \$225,000. It has been increasing year by year, until this year those in charge of the State Department have asked this Congress to appropriate a million dollars for entertainment, which is in addition to \$700,000 or \$800,000 requested by other related agencies, including the ECA, which is asking for \$350,000 for its entertainment funds.

I think the House will be interested in the further observation that the State Department, according to figures given me on good authority, since 1942 has spent more than \$6,000,000 for so-called entertainment and representation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may have some of the reasons given for these large expenditures, I would like to quote briefly from a statement by a representative of the Department before the committee in charge of this legislation. Here is what he has to say, and I quote:

Members of the Foreign Service, in order to obtain vital information to supplement other sources of information, must build up personal relationships with persons who can furnish this information. This cannot be done overnight. Initial contacts must be cultivated over a considerable period of time. It is only after an officer has established a relationship of confidence that he can ask pointed and direct questions and hope to get at least a partially frank answer to the many problems entering into our foreign relations.

It would seem to me that the method for building personal relationships and for obtaining vital information of importance to our country is, to say the least, a risky one, if our representatives in top-flight positions are relying on such method in the carrying on of negotiations with representatives of foreign countries. Surely there must be a better method of dealing with such vital problems than to depend so much upon such procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (S. 1717) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of

1947, as amended, may have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the program tomorrow the first order of business will be the peace-with-Germany resolution. It is expected that will not take long, as it was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Thereafter we will take up the offshore tidelands bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the majority leader expect to work Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I do not expect to.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I noticed an article in the press yesterday about double payment of tuition to certain universities, which is now being investigated by a House committee.

During the last Congress, a bill was reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H. R. 7057, Public Law 571, Eighty-first Congress, which provided that funds paid to land-grant colleges, under the Land Grant Acts, should not be taken into consideration in connection with funds received by the same colleges for training veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The legislation was opposed by the Comptroller General as well as the Bureau of the Budget because in principle it provided double payment for the same services, with the Government footing the bill.

I opposed the bill, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and evidence was produced on the floor, in the form of vouchers and other documents showing these duplicate payments under the Land Grant Acts and the servicemen's readjustment law, listing the same professors at the same salaries. I recall one case of six professors in a western university whose salaries were partially paid under the Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones Acts and I submitted the voucher to the House which showed that \$2,000 had been paid to these professors under the land-grant

laws. I pointed out to the House that we found the same university coming in with a cost estimate, listing these professors' salaries, for reimbursement under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and they made no deduction for the \$2,000 they had already received under the Land Grant Act.

The Veterans' Administration estimated the cost of this bill at \$10,000,000. Here you have the Federal Government paying \$20,000,000 for \$10,000,000 worth of service.

The roll call on that bill is very interesting. It is in the RECORD of March 20, 1950, and is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 3, page 3657. Those who are complaining the loudest about double tuition today voted for the bill. Four members of the Select Committee Investigating Educational Training voted for the bill and two Members were paired for the bill, which ratified and authorized future duplicate payments. Here you have a majority of a congressional committee voting for double payments and now complaining because the payments are being made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the success of Mrs. VERA BUCHANAN in the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania to replace her revered husband in this House was an important victory for the Democratic cause in our country.

We of Pennsylvania knew that Mrs. BUCHANAN would be the victor, but we have been most pleased and happy with the size of her majority.

And let there be no mistake about the campaign. Mrs. BUCHANAN carried on her crusade without mincing words. She supported the Democratic administration, and she believes in the program which the administration is carrying on through Congress. She stood foursquare behind our President. Her opponent was vehement in his criticism of our program. The people made the decision, and more than 60 percent of them stood with Mrs. BUCHANAN.

This is the fourth special election held this year. The results of these elections have been most interesting. They show a steady rise in Democratic strength. On March 9, in Missouri, the Democrats received 43.2 percent of the vote. Then on April 14, in Kentucky the Democratic majority was recorded as 55.3 percent. In West Virginia on July 17, the Democratic majority was 58.4 percent. Mrs. BUCHANAN received a majority of 61.8 percent.

These results are indicative of the temper of the American people. They reflect a desire on the part of the people to have a vigorous representation in Washington supporting our administration. This steady rise in Democratic strength means that our people want action to continue the President's struggle to achieve peace in our world and security here at home.

Note this, Mr. Speaker, in the elections in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, the percentage of Democratic votes was measurably higher than it was in 1946.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FOGARTY and to include a speech delivered this morning by Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LARCADE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. CLEMENTE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GREEN and to include an article that appeared in the Reporter.

Mr. RAMSAY and to include a letter appearing in the Ashland (Ky.) Independent.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include an editorial and other extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL and to include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. GOODWIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. BUFFETT in two instances and to include excerpts.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE.

Mr. SADLAK in connection with the funeral of Mr. Charles Ryan, secretary to a Congressman.

Mr. RANKIN and to include a bill he introduced for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and include excerpts.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include the text of an address before the Massachusetts Legislature by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army.

Mr. CLEMENTE in five instances.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an article.

Mr. RABAUT and to include a speech delivered by Dean Acheson at the birthday celebration.

Mr. RABAUT to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES and to include a statement by Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. MEADER to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. JONAS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include additional matter.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an address this morning at the Brumidi celebration in the Rotunda.

Mr. JUDD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an article appearing in the Times-Herald.

Mr. HAGEN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. REES of Kansas), for 15 days, on account of serving on maneuvers with National Guard.

Mr. SAYLOR, for an indefinite period, on account of official committee business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, of rule XXIV, the following bill with Senate amendments thereto, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

H. R. 2416. An act relating to the exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness, to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

647. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$285,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 206); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

648. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Georgette Jeanne Williams, file No. 7450296 CR 29659, and requesting that it be with-

drawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 356. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 289, joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany; without amendment (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4601. A bill to provide that the admission tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4914. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 543. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Jean Clarke; without amendment (Rept. No. 759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 581. An act for the relief of Kiyoko and Chiyoko Ishigo; without amendment (Rept. No. 760). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 585. An act for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son, Suenori Fujii; without amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner; with amendment (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Franz Geyling; with amendment (Rept. No. 763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of David Lee Harrigan; with amendment (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2165. A bill for the relief of Matthew Terry; without amendment (Rept. No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4959. A bill to continue the improvement and protection of the natural resources of the United States by providing for the

transfer to the States of certain lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and held by such States under lease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 4960. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1945, to authorize Federal payments to the States in the case of certain toll bridges made free prior to January 1, 1953; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4961. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Palm Canyon National Monument, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 4962. A bill to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs, to persons under 21 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 4963. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain fuel-fired electric generating plants in order to make it possible for the Department of the Interior to meet certain defense power requirements in the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 4964. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval and Marine Corps installations and defense production plants in such area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4966. A bill governing the hospitalization of the mentally ill of Alaska, and authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the mentally ill of Alaska and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 142; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution concerning the Secretary of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 357. Resolution to provide for an investigation of action taken by the Defense Production Administration and other agencies with respect to certificates of necessity for emergency facilities, in authorizing construction, and in making direct loans for plant expansion; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an act providing that the State of Delaware may enter into a compact with any other State for mutual

helpfulness in meeting any civil defense emergency or disaster; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 4967. A bill for the relief of Antonino Genovese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4968. A bill for the relief of Donato Calabrese and Carmela Catalano Calabrese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4969. A bill for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Lindstrom and Fred C. Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Josefina V. Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Kichizo and Yasu Nakagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

364. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Marion, Ind., requesting that every effort be put forth to bring about the release of William N. Oatis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

365. By Mr. THORNBERRY: Petition of citizens of the Tenth Congressional District of Texas, requesting that the Townsend bill be brought out of committee so that adequate care may be taken of our aged citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

366. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Filipino Businessmen's Association of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H., relative to supporting and endorsing H. R. 4298 to confer upon Hawaii the status of a State for purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 24, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, whose inward fellowship means cleansing, peace and power, we come asking that there may be dissolved the barriers that keep our souls from Thee. Save us, we pray, from a towering self-sufficiency that will not even recognize our need, from an im-

penitence too proud to confess guilt, and from the spiritual blindness that sees vividly the visible but is unaware of the invisible and eternal. May this noontide pause in the busy day be but the symbol of zones of quiet we habitually keep inviolate around our too agitated lives. We confess that the world is too much with us, in getting and spending we lay waste our powers. Save us from crippling pessimism and despair. Build Thou our inner strength and grant that we may be among those who stand in the evil day and having done all still stand. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4601. An act to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

H. R. 4740. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4601. An act to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4740. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, he and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate later this afternoon for 2 hours in order to attend the funeral of Admiral Sherman.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Record, and transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.